A Conteſt for Chriſtianity

OR

A Faithful Relation of two late

MEETINGS

Between

The Baptiſts and the Quakers;

THE

One, on the 9th of *October* 1674. in *Barbican.* The other, on the 16th of the ſame Month in *Wheeler-Street* 1674.

Together,

With ſeveral Letters that have paſſed between ſome of both Parties, both before, and ſince the aforeſaid MEETINGS.

AS ALSO,

Some Reflections upon ſeveral Paſſages, that are Publiſhed in the Account which the Quakers have given of the ſaid MEETINGS.

Publiſhed and Submitted

To the Judgment of all judicious and Impartial Men.

By *THO. PLANT.*

Read, Conſider, Examine, and then Judg.

LONDON,

Printed for *F. Smith* at the *Elephant* and *Caſtle* in *Cornhil* near the *Royal-Exchange*, and *Jonathan Robinſon* at the *Golden Lyon in* St. *Pauls Church-Yard.* 1674.

TO THE READER:

READER,

THou haſt here preſented thee a faithful Account of two late Meetings, between the Baptiſts and the Quakers, together with the Occaſion of them: as alſo what Letters paſſed in Order thereunto, whereby thou mayeſt be able to make a more certain Judgment of the matters in difference.

The Anſwer to the Quakers Appeal *being publiſhed, wherein their Folly was (not a little) made manifeſt,* William Penn *thereupon publiſhed a complaint againſt it, in which he was pleaſed to make an offer for another publick Meeting. In purſuance whereof, ſeveral of his Friends met with ſeveral of ours to diſcourſe thereabout, but they could not agree touching the matter to be inſiſted on, whereupon this following Paper was delivered to them, to be Communicated to* W. Penn, *and* George Whitehead, *&c.*

Which is as followeth.

WHereas, there are divers things charged by *William Penn*, and *George Whitehead* againſt *Tho. Hicks* in two Books, one Intituled *Reaſon againſt Raying*, the other, *The Counterfeit Chriſtian Detected*: Intimating, as if the ſaid *Tho. Hicks* had wronged the People called Quakers, by Forgery, Lying, and falſe-Quotations.

And whereas, the ſaid *W. P.* and *G. W.* or ſome other of the Quakers, did Appeal to ſober People, but eſpecially to the Baptiſts, to hear and examine, whether the ſaid *T. H.* was guilty of the ſaid Accuſations or not. And a Meeting being thereupon appointed, wherein the ſaid Charge was examined, we are fully ſatisfyed, that in all thoſe material things, then inſiſted upon, *T. H.* hath done them no wrong, of which we have given an account to the World in Print. Now whereas *William Mead* and *John Oſgood* &c. have deſired in the Name of *W. P.* and *G. W.* a publick Meeting to maintain their Charge againſt *T. H.* We Anſwer, that if there be any thing in the late Book (publiſhed for his Juſtification) called *The Quakers Appeal Anſwered*, againſt which there is any juſt exception, or any new matter farther to object againſt *T. H.* We are ready to give them ſuch a Meeting, for the Examination thereof; provided, they give us an Account of thoſe particulars in Writing beforehand, that ſo we may be prepared to give our Anſwer.

Delivered to *Will. Mead*,
Jo. Oſgood, &c. *Will. Kiffin*.
To be Communicated to, *Dan. Dyke*.
G. Whitehead, *Tho. Paul*.
Will. Pen, &c. *Tho. Plant*.

In a ſhort Time after, they ſent this Catalogue.

A

A Catalogue of those things Charged on *T. H.* either wholly omitted, or unfairly Examined, in your late publick Relation of the *Barbican*-Meeting, pointing to the particulars in the Books.

General Charges.

1. A Dialogue between a *Christian* and *Quaker* yet made by *Tho. Hicks*.

2. His Abuse of our Sufferings. *Dial.* 1. *p.* 7.

3. Beginning at [Are you as perfectly happy,]and ending at[now thou Slanderest us] *Dial.* 1. *p.* 72,73.

4. Yea, so far as they agree to the Light in me, *Dial.* 1. *p.* 66.

5. When we make use of the Scriptures, 'tis only to quiet, *&c. Dial.* 1. *p.* 24,25.

6. That the Quakers render the Holy Scriptures to be of no more Authority, than the Fables of *Esop. Dial.* 2d. *Epistle.*

7. That the Blood of Christ in their Esteem is worse than the Blood of a Common Thief, *Dial.* 1. *p.* 9. 38. *Dial.* 2d. *p.* 4.

8. That the Quakers have discovered themselves to be no other, but the Spawn of that wicked Brood the Ranters, *Dial.* 3d. *p.* 80.

9. That the Quakers owning Jesus Christ, is indeed no other than a meer Mystical Romance. *Dial.* 1. *p.* 10. *Dial.* 2d. *p.* 9.

10. That the Tendency of all the Quakers Reasoning about Instituted Religion, is to Debauch Mankind, *Dial.* 3d. *p.* 65.

11. That the Quakers appoint their Ministers aforehand, to speak in such a place, at such a time; Their Meetings are only and principally to decoy, Trepan and Inveagle others, *Dial.* 2d. *p.* 66.

12. That their Principles improved, are destructive to all humane Society, *Dial.* 2d. *p.* 69.

13. His kind of Treating us with reviling Language: Collected & Quoted in *Reason* against *Railing p.* 170, 171. *&c. Counterfeit Christian*, *p.* 130, *&c.*

14. That our Religion is a meer Cheat, Calculated only to the Service of the Devil and our own Lusts, *Dial.* 1. *p.* 62.

15. If a Merchant sell us his Goods, he must stay *&c. Dial.* 2d. *p.* 69.

Charges against Particulars.

1. THat Jesus Christ came to seek and save a lost God, and that the Seed of God in Man, only, and nothing else is taught, *Dial.* 2d. *p.* 49. 66.

2. That *Nicolas Lucas* a Real Quaker, was moved *&c. Dial.* 2. *p.* 5.

3. At [what say you thereunto? Quaker, I say the Plagues and Judgments of God will follow thee. *G. Whitehead*, *Dial.* 2d. *p.* 1.

4. His false Reflections on *Stephen Crisp*, *Dial.* 1. *p.* 44, 45.

5. His several Abuses, of *Will. Penn*, cited in his Books called *Reason against Railing*, *&c. Dial.* 3d. *p.* 1.

p. 1, 2, 4. 10. *Dial.* 2d. *p.* 52. *Dial.* 3. *p.* 13. 41. 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74. *Epist.* and the last pag. of the *Dial.*

6. The Contradictions charged on *T. Hicks Counterfeit Christian, p.* 3. 18, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54.

Further, we have several exceptions against your manner of appointment and management of the Meeting at *Barbican.*

We also except against your late Book called, *The Quakers Appeal Answered*, as not making good the Title thereof, and because many things are overlooked, for which the *Appeal* was made, and several things unfairly cited, which are but some of those many things, we have farther to Object against *T. H.* and his Abettors, when these are particularly and fully considered and determined in publick; and we having thus far condescended, we expect a publick Meeting without delay, fairly to Examine and Discourse matters, which, when done, we are willing to come to the Doctrinal Points, (which are chiefly concerned in *Tho. Hicks*, his three Dialogues) our very Aim, and End being for Truth and Righteousness: And that things may be managed in good Order.

George Whitehead, *Will.*
George Keith, *Steph. Gr[illegible].*

Upon the Receipt of the aforesaid Paper of Articles, which is word for word what they sent, this following Letter was returned to *G. Whitehead*, and *Will. Penn*, &c.

YOur Paper (without Date) we received the 28th. *last Month*, and we are willing to give you a publick Meeting; but forasmuch as you intimate, that you have several things more to object against *Tho. Hicks*, you had done well to have signified the particulars thereof also: However we desire to have some Discourse with you; in Order to the Time, Place, and Method of a publick Meeting.

Octob. 2d. 1674. *Will. Kiffin*, *Dan. Dyke*. *Tho. Paul*, *Tho. Plant*.

Whereunto this ensuing Answer was returned.

WE have received your Paper, by the hands of *Will. Mead*, we wonder at your Dilatory Answers; Know ye not, that it is near a Month, since our first offer was first made to you, for a publick Meeting; And that our Professions, and Persons, with the whole People to whom we relate, have lain under very gross Scandals, and blackest Infamy? certainly, you cannot be ignorant of what is so generally known, and your own Works proclaim, you made none of these

these nice Proposals and often put-offs, about the appointment of your *Barbican* Meeting; we deal fairly with you, after all this long stay and suffering, we Offer you any day of the next Week (the first and fourth day excepted) to meet either at your Meeting-House in *Barbican*, or at our Meeting-House, in *White-Hart-Court*, where we hope God willing, to make good our Charge against *Tho. Hicks* as lodged in our Paper lately sent you; and Answers to *Tho. Hicks*, his three *Dialogues*, and therefore no further need of particulars: did our Charge exceed, your *Proviso* were reasonable; but since it doth not, we look upon it as unnecessary, and as to Method, we are for Moderation, and Equal Liberty; We expect your Resolution as to Time and Place by the Bearer, or to morrow at farthest, we intend not to be put off with farther delays.

London 2d. 8th. Month 1674. *Geo. Whitehead, Will. Penn, Geo. Keith, Steph. Crisp.*

The Answer to this Letter was as follows.

YOurs the 2d. *Instant*, we received, wherein you wonder at our Dilatory Answers, whereas we have been as speedy and plain in them, as conveniently we could; our Habitations are remote each from other, and our Occasions oft calling us abroad, that we cannot meet so suddenly together as probably you can. In our last, we assured you of our willingness, to meet you in publick; But that the expectations of the hearers might not be frustrated, we did desire a Conference with you in Order to the Method of proceedure, which you are pleased to interpret, nice

Proposals

Proposals and put-offs: You pretend fairness, but such Answers render your pretences suspicious; we hope you design not a Tumult, or to Involve us in the Guilt of a confused and clamorous Meeting, Method and Order being requisite in all Conferences, but much more in such a Debate, as we are now in pursuance of, and 'twill be but the mispending of time, and Offensive to the hearers, should we enter upon so solemn a work, without some previous engagement to keep to some Rule. And albeit, you suggest (*as one Reason of your haste*) the Infamy that you and your Profession lies under; we say, you have no Reason to reflect the blame of that upon us, forasmuch as your own *Appeal* gave the occasion thereof; However, since we cannot gain a Conference with you, in Order to the Method of proceeding in the intended Meeting, we do hereby signifie, That we purpose (if the Lord please) to give you a publick Meeting, provided; 1. That those Charges you lately sent us, may be read openly for the informing of the people, what the business and work of that day is. 2. That *Tho. Hicks* be permitted without Interruption, to give his Answers. 3. If any of you object against him, it may be direct to the Point in as full and few words as you can. 4. That Replies be made to those Objections with the like brevity and plainness. 5. That only three or four of each party (excepting such as may be called in as Witnesses) may be allowed to speak. 6. That *Fryday next* being the 9th. *instant*, at two of the Clock precisely in the Afternoon be the time, and the Meeting-House in *Barbican*, the Place of the publick Meeting.

We expect your Complyance with us, herein, otherwise that you give us your Reasons to the contrary

ry sometime this day, or by *Monday* next at twelve of the Clock at the farthest.

October 3d. 1674. *Will. Kiffin, Dan. Dyke. Tho. Paul, Tho. Mant.*

Their Answer hereunto follows.

YOurs of this Instant, we received, and these are to let you know that we neither design any Tumult nor Disorder, but Moderation and equal Liberty in our Proceedings; you might have kept your suspitious thoughts in your own Breasts, and take Care on your parts that you do not involve us, in a confused and clamorous Meeting, and we shall take care (God assisting) that things be in a peaceable Spirit on our parts.

Touching your six Proviso's, Thus far we condescend: First, That as we have complained against *Tho. Hicks*, for his injurious work against us, so those Charges we have lately sent you, we may first read openly and fully, as in the particular Pages referred to, for the informing of the People what the business and work of that day is.

2. That upon our Examination of each particular, *Tho. Hicks* be permitted to give his Direct Answer, so as each particular Charge be fully discussed between us, before any proceeding be to another, for plainness and Orders sake.

3. That what any of us may Object, we intend it as Direct to the point, and in as full and few words as we can.

4. We

4. We alſo expect that replies be made on your parts with the like brevity and plainneſs.

5. We aſſent that but three or four of each Party, have the Management of the Diſcourſe, and that but one at once ſpeak, except ſuch as may be called in as Witneſſes; *or otherwiſe may have a neceſſity upon their Spirits to Speak to the buſineſs in hand*, which liberty we are as willing to give as take.

6. We judg the Time you prefix, is too late on the day for us to go through all the particulars; but however, that is better than none, and we ſhall accept of it, to begin with, provided we may have a further Time if need be.

7. That we, and our friends may have equal place with you and yours at the Meeting-Houſe, as we ſhould have granted you in the like Caſe.

Theſe Propoſitions if you accept of, ſend us ſpeedily, your direct Anſwer, and (if the Lord will) we intend to meet you at your Time and Place appointed, not judging our ſelves obliged farther to Treat with you about Terms in this matter.

3d. of 8th. Month, 1674. *G. Whitehead, Will. Penn, George Keith.*

POSTCRIPT

AND whether we have reaſon to reflect the blame of the Infamy (that we ſuffer under) upon you or not, from the Nature of our Appeal, Time will yet further manifeſt.

READER,

READER,

I must here inform thee, that this Letter had no Answer returned to it in Writing; for, the Person to whom it was delivered, consented to the Meeting presently, upon the Receipt of it; though afterwards, when the Letter was more maturely and deliberately read, That Passage in the 5th. *Head*, viz. (*Or otherwise such as have a necessity upon their Spirits to speak*, &c.) was disapproved of, as fearing it would prove prejudicial to the ends of the Meeting. Yet since a Consent was signified, (hopeing to prevent the Inconvenience feared) we did accordingly meet at the Time and Place appointed.

A Faithful Relation of the Principal matters Insisted on (at the Meeting in *Barbican*, *October* 9th. 1674.) between the Baptists and the Quakers.

AFter Mr. *Kiffin* had signified the occasion of the Meeting, he desired that the Paper of Charges Exhibited against *Thomas Hicks*, might be openly Read.

Whereunto *Will. Penn*, and others Replyed, that they had another Paper containing the same Charge more fully, than that Paper sent to us, which was but as it were an *Index* of what they desired might be read; accordingly for quietness sake, it was consented, that theirs should be read, as full and as large as they would, which they did do without the least Interruption. That being done, 'twas urged, that *Tho. Hicks* might now make his Answer; And being permitted, his Answer was as followeth.

Tho. Hicks.

My general Answer to this Charge is this:

Let the Reader compare this Answer with the Quakers account, & then Judg whether they were honest in their Relation.

* I do confess that I wrote these Books, called *A Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker*, wherein I have Objected several things against them, both with respect to their Opinions and Practice, yet upon search of my own heart with reference to what I have writ, or my design therein, I am not Conscious to my self, that

that I have done them the least wrong. To that particular, wherein they Accuse me for Treating them with Reviling Language, (*viz.*) *Calling them Blasphemers, Impostors, Enemies to the Christian Religion*, &c. I do not yet see Reason to abate them one Word.

Concerning that Charge wherein they accuse me, for false Reflections upon *Stephen Crisp*, I cannot own this Charge, for I have said no more of him, than what I am able to prove (*viz.*) That he affirmed to me *That he knew *the beginning and Date of my Christ*, which he repeated twice over in the hearing of many credible Witnesses.

**This they omitted to read publickly, though all the rest were read at length.*

In a word, what I have written in those *Dialogues* against the Quakers, I do here Avouch, and am ready to maintain it against them.

I shall now apply my self to their first Article; which is, A *Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker*, (yet made by *Tho. Hicks*) wherein is represented some of the most chief and concerning Opinions of the Quakers together with their Method and Manner of Reasoning in the defence thereof.

I do acknowledg this Charge, confess I wrote a Book with such a Title-Page; If then there be any thing Criminal herein, it must either respect the form of Writing, (*i. e.*) a *Dialogue*, or the matter written, (*viz.*) Opposing the Christian to the Quaker, representing the Quakers Opinions, together with their manner of Reasoning.

To the first I Answer,

1. That such a Method of Writing is not unlawful in it self.

2. I

2. I chose that Method, the better to accommodate my Discourse to the meanest Capacity.

3. Such a form of writing hath been used both by Antient and Modern Christians.

4. The Quakers themselves have wrote after the same manner, for Instance, *William Smiths Primmer*, wherein we have a Discourse (*i. e.*) *a Dialogue* between a Father and a Child.

Give me leave to Read to you, some parts of the Discourse:

Child. HOw may I know which is the true *i. e. Ministers* and which is the false by their words, seeing their words may be the same?

Father. They that are false, Preach Christ without, and bid people believe in him, as he is in Heaven above; but they that are true, Preach Christ within, *Smiths Primmer*, p. 8.

Child. This is a great difference in their Doctrine, for one to Preach Christ without, and another to Preach Christ within.

Father. Yea; It doth make as great a difference, and hath no more Fellowship together than the *East* hath with the *West*, p. 9.

Child. And is this an infallible Tryal of them?

Father. Yea, it will not deceive thee, but will certainly give thee understanding. *Ibid.*

Child. But must not I try all things by the Scriptures?

Father. Nay, *&c. Ibid.*

Child. I would know *Father*, How it is concerncerning those things called Ordinances, as Baptism, and Bread, and Wine, which are much used in their Worship?

Father.

Father. Why Child, As to these things, they rose from the Popes Inventions, who had Power, in the night of Apostacy, and hath set up his own Devices, *&c. p.* 36.

Obj. It may be they will Object, that the Answers given in the Quakers Names, in my *Dialogues* are not their own words, therefore 'tis a Forgery; I Reply, That if the Answers given, be either in their own Words, or the necessary Consequence of their Words, then no wrong is done to them. I shall instance in some few Answers, which *William Penn* is pleased to account Forgery.

Q. Did the Light within, create the Heavens, and the Earth?

A. Yea.

Q. Is the Light within, the immediate Object of Divine Worship?

A. Yea.

Q. Do you own the Scriptures to be the true sayings of God?

A. Yea, So far as they agree to the Light in me; See Dial. 1. p. 65, 66.

These Answers I do confess, have given in their Names, they being the necessary Consequences of this Opinion of theirs, (*viz.*) *That the Light wherewith every Man is enlightened, is God, and the very Christ of God*; For, if the Light within every Man be God, then it must be *the Creator, The immediate Object of Divine Worship, and the Author of the Scriptures.*

Or otherwise, there is a God, that did not create the Heavens and the Earth, That is not the Object of Divine Worship; And that is not the Author of the Scriptures.

Thus much was spoken to the first part of their Charge.

2. If it be, that I have opposed the Christian to the Quaker, *&c.* I suppose 'tis this, they account most Criminal; forasmuch, as *Will. Penn*, esteems it, as a part of my excessive bitterness, and as a scurrilous and invective Expression: *Reason against Railing*, *p.* 170.

My Answer hereunto, shall be under these two Heads.

1. To let you know, who I mean by Quaker.

2. Why I oppose the Quaker to the Christian.

1. By Quaker I mean such as *George Fox* Senior, and Junior, *Edward Burroughs*, *George Whitehead*, *William Penn*, *Stephen Crisp*, *and James Naylor*, *&c.*

2. Why I oppose these to the Christian, is because they directly oppose themselves to Christ, and his Religion; but more particularly,

1. Because they deny Christ, who is the Head of the Christian Religion, for they deny him, to be a Person distinct from us, and without us.

2. Because they set up another Christ, instead of the true Christ of God.

3. Because they set up another God instead of the True God; and thereby subvert all Religion.

4. Because they deny the Law, and Rule of the Christian Religion.

5. Because they deny the greatest Promises and Motives of the Christian Religion, *viz.* the Resurrection of this Body, and the Life to come.

I shall begin with the first, *viz.*

They deny Christ, who is the Head of the Christian Religion; for they expresly deny him to be a Person distinct from us, and without us.

I

I shall give it you in their own words.

'Tis a design of Satan to keep Men in Carnal Imaginations, and dark thoughts of a humane personal Christ, *G. Whitehead, Christ ascended*, p. 27.

'Art thou so destitute of Common Sense, as to think of proving the Quaker no Christian, because he denies a Doctrine not expressed in Scripture, (that is, denies Jesus Christ to be a distinct Person without us) *William Penn counterfeit Christian*, p. 77.

'God's Christ, is not distinct from the Saints: *G. Fox Great Mystery*, p. 201.

'If there be any other Christ but he that was Crucified within, he is the false Christ, *G. Fox Gr. Myst.* p. 206.

'He is a false Minister, that doth Preach Christ without, and bid people believe in him, as he is in Heaven above, *Smiths Primmer*, p. 8.

'I know the Beginning and Date of thy Christ: *Stephen Crisp*, see *Dial.* 1. p. 44, 45.

In a word, (according to their own Explication of the word Person,) they do deny Christ to be a true & real Man, and though sometimes they talk of his Manhood, yet 'tis with these Diminutive Expressions, *That it is Christs Body or bodily appearance, his Garment*, but by no means will they call that the Christ, (unless it be in a less proper sence) hence *William Penn* desires us *to distinguish between Christ and the Body of Christ, Reas. against Rayl.* p. 54, 55.

Whereas, (not now to speak of his Godhead which I acknowledg and believe) there is nothing more plain, than that the true Christ, was and is a Real Man, not only because he is, (as Mediator) so commonly called, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. from first to last, till as Man he hath Judged the World, *Acts* 17. 31. But also because he

is called Christ every-where in reference to those things which would not agree with him, unless he were a Man, *Luke* 2. 11. *Unto you is born this day a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord*: See his own words, Luke, 24 26,46 *Ought not Christ to have suffered these things. Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead*; Acts 3. 36. *God hath made that same Jesus, whom you Crucified both Lord and Christ.*

God hath anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with Power, who went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed of the Devil, for God was with him, and we are Witnesses, what he did both in the Land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem, *whom they slew and hanged upon a Tree: Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly, not to all people, but unto Witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him, after he rose from the Dead, &c.* Acts 10. 38, 39, 40, 41.

This same Jesus *Visibly ascended and shall return in like manner*, Acts 1. 11. Till when, *the Heavens must receive him*, Acts 3. 21. *Where he is able to save to the utmost all that come to God by him, seeing he ever lives to make intercession for them*; none of all which can agree to any, but a Person without us, and distinct from us.

Now they who deny this, deserve not the Name of *Christians*, because the Rise, and Reason of the Name *Christian*, was from the believing and following of Christ's Doctrine, *Acts* 11. 20, 21. unto which *Agrippa*, being almost perswaded, *was almost perswaded to be a Christian*, *Acts* 26. 28. which Doctrine, we have in *ver.* 23. *That Christ should suffer and be the first that should rise from the Dead*, (not the Bodily

ly appearance, or the Garment, the (Quakers Phraſe,) which is wholly unſcriptural; But) that Chriſt himſelf ſhould ſuffer and riſe from the Dead.

To ſuffer for ſuch Belief, and following of him is to ſuffer as Chriſtians, 1 *Pet.* 4. 14. 16.

All which the Quakers renouncing, cannot be Chriſtians.

For the Belief of this ſame Chriſt, thus ſet forth in the Holy Scriptures, is neceſſary to the Salvation of all that hear it; for upon this Rock the Church was built, (*viz.*) *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God.* Thou, a perſon without him, viſible to his Eyes, and who talked with him.

Which I ſhall leave to the People, whether he was a diſtinct Perſon or not.

Again, *If you believe not that I am He, ye ſhall dye in your ſins*, Joh. 8. 24; which *He*, himſelf explains, to be *the Son of Man*, *ver.* 28. ſee *Rom.* 10. 9. *If thou believe in thine heart, that God raiſed him from the Dead*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 15. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

The Truth is, Men may as well queſtion all firſt, and ſelf-evident Principles. And whether the Sun be up whilſt it is day, as queſtion this; whether Chriſt who did, and ſpake, ſo as never Man did do, or ſpeak before, in the ſight and hearing of thouſands of Men, were a Perſon without them and diſtinct from them or not, nay we have all as much reaſon to doubt of our Senſes (the moſt ſure evidence) whether all the People of this Congregation, are Perſons, or meer Phantaſms. And whether we are not in a Dream, and under the power of Imagination, when we think them ſo; From whence I argue.

Here *William Penn* and others of his Friends interrupted, and took up much time about other matters,

running from this first, unto the third Charg, which respects several Answers given in their Names, *Dial.* 1. 72, 73.

But *William Penn*, seeing that no Answer would be given to those things till the first Article was concluded.

He then, with others of his Assistants, for a considerable time, insisted upon the form of writing, pretending, as if this were their chief quarrel with *T. H.* under this first Head: But this being fully Answered, at least to the satisfaction of all the Impartial hearers; Then *William Penn* being over-ruled by the Auditory, was pleased to condescend, that those Reasons why the Quakers were opposed to the Christian, should be spoken unto, though withal he signified that they came not thither to dispute Doctrines.

Tho. Hicks. They who deny the true Christ of God, are no Christians.

But the Quakers deny the true Christ of God, therefore they are no Christians.

Will. Penn. I deny it.

T. H. I suppose you deny the second Proposition; If so, I prove it.

They that deny Jesus Christ to be a distinct Person from us, and without us, deny the true Christ of God.

But *William Penn*, in the Name of the Quakers, doth deny Jesus Christ to be a distinct Person from us and without; therefore *William Penn*, and the Quakers, do deny the true Christ of God.

That *William Penn* doth so, and that in the Name of the Quakers, see his *Counterfeit Christian*, p. 77. *Art thou* (saith he) *so destitute of common sense, as to think to prove the Quaker no Christian, because he denies*

denies (that is, Jesus Christ to be a distinct person without us) a Doctrine not expressed in Scripture.

Will. Penn. I desire to know, what thou meaneſt by Perſon?

Tho. Hicks. By Perſon in this Argument, I mean what you underſtand by the word Perſon, (*viz.*) That Chriſt is a true Man, which you Quakers deny him to be.

Here they were deſired to give their direct Anſwer.

Will. Penn. We own the Man Jeſus Chriſt.

T. H. This Anſwer is not ſatisfactory: For by Man, you either intend, that once he was in the form of a Man, but not that he is ſo now; or by Man, you mean ſomething diſtinct from and of another Nature than that which was taken of the Virgin; ſo that this Anſwer at beſt is but equivocal: for we know, That you are ſo far from believing Chriſt to be a true Man, diſtinct from us; That ſome of you have affirmed, That Chriſt was never ſeen with Carnal Eyes, nor heard with Carnal Ears; *Humphry Wolrich* Declaration to the Baptiſts, *p.* 13.

Geo. Keith. I diſtinguiſh; Chriſt as God was never ſeen with Carnal Eyes, but as Man he was.

Jer. Ives. Thy Friend makes no ſuch diſtinction, beſides, he was Chriſt as he was Man. How then is it true, that Chriſt was never ſeen with Carnal Eyes?

G. K. The Term or Name Chriſt, is ſometimes applyed to him as God, ſometimes as Man, ſometimes to the very Body; but the Queſtion is, whether this Term or Name, belong more properly to him as God, or to the Manhood? we affirm that Name to be given to him moſt properly as God, leſs properly as Man; and leaſt properly to his Body.

J. Iust. But you say, Christ was never seen with Carnal Eyes, *&c.* Why do you not speak to the Point?

W. P. When our Friend saith, Christ was never seen with Carnal Eyes *&c.* It is meant of the Divine Nature which is the more excellent and better part, *&c.*

J. I. By the same Rule, if I should write a Book, and publish to the World that I had never seen *W. P.* and *G. K.* in all my Life, and they should tell me I lyed, because I saw them at this Meeting; May I not Answer them with this Distinction, as they do me, And say, that *W. P.* and *G. K.* consist of Soul and Body; and because I never saw their Souls, which is their more Excellent Part, Therefore I never saw them.

Note, *That this Opinion of the Quakers that Christ was not seen with Carnal Eyes, is laid down by them in opposition to the Priests and false ministers (as they call them.) But if* W. P. *and* G. K's *Distinction be good: then they make their Friends to fight with the Ayr: for who doth he oppose? Since never any was so Idle, as to Preach that the Divine-Nature was ever seen with Carnal Eyes: So that either they make their Friend write vainly, or else their distinction is here Impertinent.*

We ask you whether the Human Nature be a part of the true Christ of God now in Hecaven making intercession for us?

Here they all sate down as Men astonish'd, for a considerable time.

An Answer was called for again, and again, but the Quakers sate Speechless.

where-

Whereupon, *J. I.* signifyed to the People, how that they (the *Quakers*) had all along deceived and abused them, for you see (saith he) how silent they are, [which was a wonder to behold, Men of their confidence, to be so Gravely Mute, for so long a time together] At last, the People cryed out *Answer, why do not you Answer?*

W. P. We do Believe the Holy Manhood to be a Member of the Christ of God.

J. I. This is not to the Question, which is, whether the Human Nature be a part of the Christ of God now in Heaven making Intercession for us? Whereunto, we could gain no direct Answer.

Upon this *J. I.* and *T. H.* withdrew.

Which *G. W.* and *W. P.* taking notice of, called for Candles, and took the opportunity to insinuate to the people, their Belief concerning Christ; *though in their own Account thereof in Print; they have detected themselves, as may appear afterwards.*

It being late, and the Meeting Place much Damaged, it was mutually agreed that this Meeting should be dismissed. *T. P.* and *T. H.* Offering that some of their Friends should meet with some of the Quakers in Order to agree about another Meeting. This is the substance of what passed that day.

Reader for an Account of the Quakers disingenuous Behaviour that day, I refer thee to a Book Intituled *the Quakers Quibbles*, published by an Ingenuous indifferent Person.

Af-

After this (not hearing from them) and considering the unlikelihood of ever coming to a right understanding each of other, in such a publick Meeting, we, in pursuance of what was offered to them, sent to *G. Whitehead*, and *W. Penn*, *G. Keith*, and *Stephen Crisp*, as followeth.

BEing desirous that those particulars charged by you in your late Paper against *Tho. Hicks* may be fully spoken unto, we are willing to have some farther Meetings with you; But forasmuch, that in publick Meetings Tumults and Noises happen, and we know not where to lay the blame, nor how to prevent; besides the Hazards of many persons lives, and the not obtaining, that which either Party ought to aim at, (*viz.*) the clearing of the Truth, and the profit of them that hear; we therefore propose for a continued Meeting with you as followeth.

1. That but 50 or 60 persons of each Party do meet as hearers, and they nominated.

2. That but three of each Party be suffered to Speak; And when one of one Party hath spoken, then one of the other Party to give an Answer, and that no Interruption be of either, and that each one speak as full and brief to the Point as he can.

3. That

3. That besides the abovesaid number of Speakers and Hearers, each party shall bring two Sober, Judicious, and disinterested Persons, to moderate and prevent disorders which may happen on either side.

4. That each Party have two to write.

5. That all which are of your Party, sit at oneend, and all of ours at the other end of the Room; that if any disturbance be, we may know who to blame.

6. That each that is to be admitted into the aforesaid Meeting, bring a Ticket with him, with his Name in it.

7. That the first Meeting begin on *Fryday* seven-Night, being the 23d instant, at two of the Clock precisely, and to end at five.

8. That the Meeting continue still on the same day fortnight from and to the hours aforesaid, untill all the particulars in the aforesaid Paper be fully discourſed; that so we may come to a better understanding of each other.

9. That when your Paper is Answered, That *G. Whitehead*, and *Will. Penn*, be obliged to give their Answers to such Charges as *Tho. Hicks* shall exhibit against them.

10. That then the whole Discourse be drawn up, and published to the World.

11. If you will comply with these Propoſals, give us notice, or otherwise be pleased to give us a Meeting some day this week, that we may discourse with you the reason of them: and if any others more apt may be offerd, we shall be willing to comply with them.

Will. Kiffin,
Dan. Dyke.
Jer. Ives,
Tho. Hicks,
Tho. Plant.

London,
October the 12*th*
1674.

About

About two hours after the delivery of the above mentioned Propoſals, Mr. *Kiffin* received a Letter from them; But they taking no notice of the Contents of ours, we Anſwered it by Silence; The next day they ſent this following Letter, Directed to *William Kiffin*, &c.

WE Received your Propoſals, dated *October the* 12th. Which admit of ſo much delay, for the Proſecution of our Charges againſt *Tho. Hicks*, as we cannot yield unto, nor will our Occaſions permit ſuch a tedious Attendance; as alſo we do not perceive that you intend Juſtice againſt *Tho. Hicks*, in your New Propoſitions, (a private Meeting, not being Anſwerable to his publick Injuries) however there remaineth a Cry for it. Wherefore theſe are to acquaint you that we are intended (if the Lord will) to have a Meeting the next 6th day, being the 16th *Inſtant* at the 9th *hour* in the Morning, at our publick Meeting place near *Wheelers Street*, where you may have equal Liberty, and where we intend to purſue our Charge againſt *Tho. Hicks* (if he appear there) and we are intended to adhere to our former Terms, aſſented to by you, (though not kept on your Part) for the Ordering of the laſt Meeting, and to endeavour what in us lyeth for quietneſs in this Meeting; for which cauſe we have pitched upon Time and Place.

London, 13th 8th Month 1674. *Geo. Whitehead*, *Jeſper Batt*, *Geo. Keith*, *Will. Penn*.

And

And in another, ſubſcribed by *Will. Mead*, *Will. Welch*, &c. They ſignified to us, that if we pleaſed to meet them at the Place aboveſaid, in the Morning of the ſame day about eight, to confer with them on ſuch a way as we may take our Liberty in the ſaid place *&c.*

Unto both which we Replyed as followeth.

AS by our late Meeting with you at *Barbican*, on the 9th Inſtant, and our voluntary, candid, and general Offer to you, made at the ending of that for another; So in purſuance thereof, by our Letter to you delivered on the 12th *Inſtant*, we gave you ſufficient proof, and are ready to evidence it to all Men, of our forwardneſs to proceed in the full Examination and Tryal of whatſoever you have Charged on *Tho. Hicks*, about the matter contained in his *Dialogues*; and therewithal, an exact Tryal and Diſquiſition *of your Tenets*, whether conſiſtent with the true Chriſtian Religion or not; Aſſuring you that we eſteem it of ſuch Importance, to the Eternal Salvation of Men, that we are ſo far from declining it, that it is a matter of free Choice, and a thing greatly deſirable to us: And ſo much the more, ſince you do not confeſs, but indeed deny (though covertly) the very Perſon of our bleſſed Lord and Saviour, to be truly Man, as well as truly God; provided only, ſuch a Meeting might be regulated according to thoſe peaceable Propoſals of ours laſt ſent unto you, or ſuch other as you might

might have superadded in a previous Meeting to that purpose, which was therein likewise offered you. In all which, our intentions are not capable of other Construction, than candid, sincere, and peaceful, and in no wise Dilatory, and aim at nothing, but such an orderly Search and Enquiry, as might prove effectual to its end, (*viz.*) That the Truth of things might appear nakedly and plainly, and not lye hid and disguised (for Truth neither needs nor seeks covers or corners) and therefore we did propose about a hundred Witnesses present, and then to be exactly transcribed, and exposed to publick View and Judgment. All which is drowned and lost in the Acclamations, and Exclamations of such a populous and numerous Assembly; As by the late instance of *Barbican* too much appears, especially on your part too apparently, notwithstanding which, Instead of Answering our Proposals, you send to us without taking the least notice of the Contents of ours, but wholly waving so much as the mention of them: And would limit us (as if you had an absolute Sovereignty over us, and our occasions) to a Meeting with you on the very same day, at a certain place and hour, and this too, whilst our said Proposals were wholly slighted, and lay upon you yet unanswered; which is such a manner of procedure, and so like a Design to surprize, in order to some vain boast (if it might be) that we never presumed to put the like unfairness upon you.

All which is the more observable, and considerable, in regard, that the next day your whole Design accordingly appeared in another Letter from you; wherein you intimate a previous intention, and resolve to hold a publick Meeting of your own on the 16th *Instant* to pursue your Charge against *Tho. Hicks*, which publick

lick-Meeting you tell us shall begin at 9 in the Morning, and offer us (according to your wonted Ingenuity) a private Meeting at 8 of the same morning just one hour before) to confer about the manner of it, whereas, when (in pursuance of your Appeal to us) we first intended a Meeting at *Barbican*, and gave you no less than 12, or 13. days notice, albeit we were not concerned, or obliged to give you any at all; for neither did the Tenour of your *Appeal* require it, nor yet desire it of us, but only a Disposition in us of fairness and candour.

Wherefore if you will go on to pursue your unreasonable and siniſter Designs, we shall consider at leisure, what we are concerned to do for the farther Detecting both of things and persons, which we desire, and hope God will in due season make manifest, to the disabusing of all misguided Persons; that they may firmly and faithfully adhere to the true Christ of God, and his most Holy Religion; which we (among other Christians) are concerned to profess and maintain against all Corrupters, or oppugners of the same.

Now whether you, or we intend fairness, we propose as followeth.

1. That if 60 of each side be too few, we are willing there may be 100 or 150 of each party to meet as hearers, and they nominated; and that this Meeting be at such a convenient place, as both you and we may agree on, *&c.* repeating all the former Proposals, which here we omit.

The

The reasonableness of these Proposals is obvious, so many Books must be read, several Witnesses Examined: Insomuch, that 'twill be impossible for all the particulars in your Paper to be fully spoken to in one day: If therefore, you will comply with these Offers, we shall (God willing) be ready and willing to attend you; if not, let the World judg where the fault lies.

London,
Octob. 14th 1674.

Tho. Paul, *Jer. Ives*,
Tho. Plant, *Jos. Morton*.

Directed to *G. Whitehead*,
Will. Penn, *G. Keith*, &c.

The next Evening late, *J. Ives* received this following Letter from them.

YOur Letter shews you have a good Opinion of your selves: how well you deserve it, Time (and that but a little too) we hope will manifest. We have left off wondring at your sort of Confidence, and are sufficiently Armed against all farther Illusion. To pretend fairness, and yet act so fouly, becomes not Men of Candour, much less such high pretenders to Christianity; can you give your selves such famous Epithetes; yet say, we deny the Lords Christ, after so fair and full Confession, in our plain and honest

Answers,

Anſwers, to your unfair and interrupting queſtions; Tell us, we intreat you, is this to Act ſincerely to, reflect the rudeneſs of the *Barbican* Meeting upon us ſo Innocent; after your Treacherous and unjuſt Carriage towards us in that place? Treacherous, in betraying of us, into a Multitude, without that equal Place, and fair Treatment agreed upon; Unjuſt, ſince you declined the Subject; and inſtead of proving your Charge, fell to Catechizing of us. This is confirmed by the complaint of ſeveral indifferent Perſons, whoſe Minds were filled with juſt diſpleaſure againſt your partial procedure. Again, what Men that would be thought modeſt, would inſiſt upon ſuch poor Shifts to evade this Meeting? Did you not promiſe to right us, as publickly as we complain'd we had wrong done us; (if wrong'd) and in Order to it, openly conſented to another Meeting? and what other Meeting was that? Not a private one, if you intended as we intended, for that could not reach our Caſe: Beſides, it was then excepted againſt, and our demands aſſented to, as we apprehended. You ſeem mightily afraid of being limited, and write to us, as if we aſſumed an abſolute Sovereignty over you, and your occaſions; but this may be more aptly inverted. Did not you limit us as Men of abſolute power, over us and ours, when you ſent a ſort of Summons, for ſome of us to be at *Barbican* the 28th 6th Month, and proceeded againſt us in our undeſigned Abſence? Well, but that is no Preſident, it's granted; but did we not comply with your appointment of Time and Place the laſt Week? and is it not now due to us, to do the like? your Adjournments are too Dilatory, we cannot diſpence with them, for at the Rate of three hours, in two weeks, the Controverſie may take up Months, if not

years, for ought we know, before it ends. If you love Truth, and intend a Meeting, which you pretend at leaſt, you would leſs plead your occaſions againſt that ſpeedy courſe we have offerred, for ending of this Debate; that ſo Truth may be manifeſted from Fiction. But you recommend to us, your candour in giving us 12 or 13 days notice of your firſt *Barbican Meeting*, that you may the better inſinuate, we are unfair, in giving you but an hour before the time appointed, to conſider of the manner of ours; But can you Believe your ſelves? Have you forgot that you were invited to meet our Friends the 12th Inſtant at *T. Rudyards*, and you took ſo little notice of it, as very un-neighbourly, you did not ſo much as ſend a Note, to acquaint our Friends, you would not, or could not be there: Beſides, you ſent not to us 12 or 13 days before the *Barbican*-Meeting to confer about the manner of it, and therefore unfitly alluded to, but we hope upon recollection, you will find, that we deſired you to meet us an hour before the time prefixt for the Meeting; not to Treat of the Manner of it, but the better to accommodate you with Room, *&c.* For your new Propoſitions, we think them beſides the matter. If you ſay you intend not to meet again upon the old ones, after the firſt Meeting was diſſolved, (as we have cauſe to ſuſpect) 'tis evident that you dealt deceitfully with us; but if you meant that the Meeting ſhould be upon the old Terms, which *Will. Kiffin* confeſſed to be very fair, & upon which we have publickly met; why ſtand you off from us? we think them as good and proper as ever they were; and that it is but equal, that as you appointed us to Meet you at *Barbican*, about two in Afternoon, on the 9th Inſtant, ſo that we might as well invite you to meet

us

us, at our Meeting-Place, near *Wheelers-Street*, about the 9th hour, in the Morning, being the 16th Instant where we ſhall be ready, through God's Aſſiſtance to make good our Charge already exhibited againſt *T. Hicks*, according to the afore-accepted Method.

London 15th 8th Month, 1674.

Geo. Whitehead,
Will. Penn,
Geo. Keith,
Jaſper Batt.

THis Letter was delivered ſo late the night before the Meeting, that there was not time to return any Anſwer to it in Writing; and though no more were ſaid to it, but to refer the Reader to the foregoing Letter; it might ſuffice to convince any Impartial Perſon, of the rudeneſs and Impertinencies of the Quakers Reply thereunto; However, it may not be amiſs, (if in this place) ſome Paſſages therein be a little Animadverted. They reflect *unfairneſs and want of Candour, upon the Perſons that ſubſcribed the foreſaid Papers*, but wherein it doth appear (in that Letter) they are Guilty, I ſuppoſe none but prejudiced perſons can diſcern. And whereas they ſeem to wonder, that any *who pretends to Chriſtianity, ſhould ſay, that they deny the Lord's Chriſt.* This is not only ſaid, but will (when the Quakers are free to ſubmit to an orderly Meeting) be proved againſt them; But *they have given (if we will believe them) fair and full Confeſſion, to unfair and interrupting Queſtions.* Whatever Confeſſions they have made, themſelves have detected

those Confessions, as will more fully appear hereafter; we know 'tis Common and ordinary with them, to mean nothing less than what their words seem to import.

Again, they are troubled, *that the Rudeness of the* Barbican-*Meeting should be reflected on them, &c.* Did they not deserve it? yea, was it not apparent to every impartial Person there present? Was there not a deep silence when any of them spake, whereas on the other side, if any were speaking, what a noise and clamour was there? from whom this should arise, 'tis easy to guess. And touching *Will. Penns* behaviour at that Meeting, it hath been signified to him, in a friendly Epistle, *Intituled the Quakers Quibbles*, &c.

Further they are pleased to say, *they were Treacherously betrayed into a Multitude, without equal place.* If by them, they mean them that subscribed the Letter now under consideration, Then what they say, is manifestly untrue; forasmuch as they had the best place in that Meeting. As for others of their Party, they were at Liberty to provide for themselves, as well as others on the contrary side.

But they add, *we were unjust too, in declining the Subject to be proved*; Herein they err, for whatever of fault there was of this kind, it most properly reflects on themselves, for we would have kept to it, but they declined it. And as *for those shifts they insinuate, that were used to evade this Meeting, &c.* let the Reader examine what was proposed to them, and then Judg.

But to palliate and excuse their Imposing on others, They Query: *Did not we limit them as to the first* Barbican-*Meeting, &c.* The Answer is, That Meeting was of another Nature, they having made an Appeal, it properly belonged to them to whom the

Appeal

Appeal was made, to appoint their own Time and Place, to hear and examine the accuſed Perſon, yet nevertheleſs, (though the Appeal obliged them not) yet they gave them 12 or 13 days notice thereof, that ſo they might be preſent if they pleaſed. But, ſuppoſe, there had been a failure, muſt this be a Preſident for them to walk by? ought they themſelves to do that which they condemn in others? *They confeſs 'tis no Preſident*, yet they ſay, *they complyed as to Time and Place the laſt Meeting*; What then were they impoſed upon? Yea, were they not left wholly to their own Liberty, whether they would comply or not? Which if they had not been free to do, there would have been no Meeting at that Time. But how is their complyance improved? Themſelves ſignifie it in theſe words, *'tis their due now*: Not ſo, 'tis not their due to impoſe on any, both as to Tme and Place without their conſent; why do they aſſume ſuch a power & Dominion? Surely not becauſe 'tis their due, as they fondly Imagine; what other Reaſon then do they give for it? *'tis this, Our Adjournments are too Dilatory*; wherein? *Becauſe three hours in two weeks may take up the Controverſie Months, if not years, for ought they know.* It ſeems then, if we met once a week, it might take up Months, for ought they know. But why do they fear that the Controverſy ſhould take up years? Is it not becauſe 'tis doubtful on their parts? Or is it not that they like not a fair and full Diſquiſition of the matters in difference. Therefore they are for a more ſpeedy Courſe. And what is that? To carry it by Clamour and Rudeneſs: for otherwiſe, they ſuſpect an orderly and regulated Meeting, would not much ſerve their Deſign; And whereas they are diſpleaſed, *That their Friends were not*

met with at T. Rudyards. The Perſons they expected had no reaſon to give them any ſuch Meeting, foraſmuch, as they took not the leaſt notice of what they had ſent but a little before unto them.

Further they do eſteem *thoſe Propoſitions ſent, to be beſides the matter.* And why ſo? Becauſe, they love not to be obliged to Order and Method, and becauſe they would have Liberty for any that have a neceſſity (that is a Motion) upon their Spirits to ſpeak, which indeed would deſtroy the very ends of the Meeting.

To conclude, 'tis not equal, becauſe the one Party names Time and Place, leaving it with the other, whether thou wouldſt accept or not, That therefore, the other ſhould impoſe both, without the like Liberty.

AN

AN

Account of the Second MEETING,

Between the

Baptists and the **Quakers**:

NEAR

Wheelers-Street in *Spittle-Fields London*, *October* the 16th. 1674.

Between *J. Ives* &c. on the one Part, and *William Penn*, *George Whitehead*, and *George Keith*, &c. on the other.

THE People being Assembled, *William Penn* bespeaks their Patience and Silence, and then some time was spent by the Quakers among themselves, in Questions and Answers one to another, about *T. Hicks* his Absence; and whether the reason thereof might not be for want of timely notice; to which, Answers were returned, that he had notice of the Meeting

time enough, but yet they thought he would not be at it, with much to this purpose.

J. Ives. Clamors and Noises you know how prejudicial they are to all solemn Meetings, they are so to us that speak, and much more to you that hear; therefore I earnestly Intreat your Patience, that so there may be no Obstructions to the Audience.

Now concerning *T. H.* (about whom they of the other side have spent some time to know the Reason of his Absence) I think good to let you know that he is not Concerned to be here this day, in Order to defend himself in a matter concerning which, the other side have Appealed to us, because this Time and Place was not agreed on, neither by *T. H.* nor any of his Friends to whom you made your Appeal.

This Meeting therefore being appointed without Consent, there is no reason they should expect his Appearance, therefore his Absence was thought Advisable that the World might know (what-ever you pretend to) that you have no power to dispose of us and our Affairs at your Pleasure, or that we should be at your Beck, whenever you should give us a Summons.

Will. Penn. The force of the Objection made by *J. Ives*, against our expecting *T. H.* his being here I conceive to be this (*viz.*) the want of his Assent and Consent to the Time and Place of Meeting (which he saith was necessary) as also, the Assent and Consent of the Baptists and other sober Persons, to whom we made our Appeal; to which I Answer, that we have used means to procure such a Meeting, but withal thought that it was not necessary, being it would occasion too much delay, and that this Meeting was rather an Adjournment, than a new Meeting, being in pursu-

pursuance of the former and not of any new Proposition.

J. Ives. I have heard what *Will. Penn* hath said, in Construing us to be Dilatory in these matters, and how that there was no need of any such previous Agreements, both as to Time and Place, *&c.* because there was no new Matter presented, and that this Meeting was rather an Adjournment than a new Meeting, *&c.* but let me tell you that if a Meeting, and the Manner be agreed on, it is as Reasonable that the Time and Place should be so too; but further, if the Persons concerned, have found by Experience that neither God can be honoured, or the People edified, which ought to be the great ends of such Meetings; would they not be Rendered very unwise if they should not consult of some other Method by which those great ones might be best secured, and for that end we sent you a Paper of * Proposals for the better ordering our Meeting which you waved, and took no notice of in your Letter to us.

* *Which are the Proposals Printed in the beginning of this Book.*

W. Penn. We understood no necessity of new Proposals.

J. Ives. Because you understood no necessity, doth it therefore follow there was none?

W. Penn. For as much as you appointed the former Meeting, we thought we might appoint this; but that we might leave you without Excuse, we gave you notice of a Meeting at *Tho. Rudyards* House the last second day, by a Letter delivered to *Will. Kiffin*, that 5 of you would meet with 5 of us to Consult about this present Meeting, to which you were so unkind

unkind(to say no more)as not to come or send any Reason to the Contrary.

J. I. I say you are under a mistake for the former Meeting was appointed by mutual Consent and so was not this.

It is true indeed, they sent us a Letter to that purpose, but withal, they took no notice of our Letter, with Proposals sent to them before their's came to us; and in their Letter they gave us but three hours warning before their intended Meeting, and in which Letter they declared a previous Resolution to meet at this Time and Place, without any Agreement or Consent on our part, and therefore it was not only not Reasonable, but also not possible to Return an Answer at so short a Warning.

Will. Mead. As to that Letter mentioned, it was ready on the 2d. day in the Morning, and I acquainted *Will. Kiffin* with it at the Exchange.

J. Ives. Will. Kiffin did say that he had notice given him of such a Letter by *VVill. Mead*, but withal *VVill. Mead* told him the Letter was not finished; and at the same time *VVill. Mead* received ours.

VVill. Mead. That I should say the Letter was not finished: *J. Ives* adds; Indeed I told him it was unseal'd, and that I would go and fetch it and deliver it to him.

J. Ives. I will prove that you said the Letter was not finished, and therefore I add nothing; besides, you do as good as confess it; for now you say it wanted Sealing.

VV. P. It is very like that might be the meaning, that want of Sealing, was a want of finishing of it.

J. Ives. It might be so.

VV. P.

W. P. And concerning the last Meeting, the disorders thereof were not occasioned by us.

J. Ives. I shall not reflect upon that now, but for prevention of the like disorders, I offer this, that there be such a Meeting agreed upon, as is tender'd in our Propolals sent to you; take me fairly, not that I would have you Subject to them all, but you shall have Liberty to expunge, what Article shall be thought not convenient; and put in what you think more convenient as we shall agree; but if this be not allowed, I will thus far (as I have done already at the *Barbican*-Meeting) espouse the first Article exhibited by you against *Thomas Hicks*, wherein he Intimates the Quakers to be no Christians (if I may be admitted) and my Reason is, because it is a Common Cause, and that wherein the honour of God and the Salvation of Men is concerned; I will therefore (if you please) offer my Reasons to prove that you are no Christians, and I should be very glad if either you can convince us, or any of us, that we are mistaken, or if God shall so honour our Meeting, that we should convince you, that you have mistaken your selves.

W. P. If you please to take notice, *Tho. Hicks* hath been charged by the People called Quakers, to be a Lyar, and a Slanderer against our Fame, Writings, Profession, Persons; *&c.* This is our Charge.

It was not to debate the Truth or errour of Doctrine, that we called upou the Baptists for Justice, it is unreasonable to think that we should call upon them who are against our Faith, to Judg, whether it be true or no. But now for them to give the go-by; to that horrible black mat-

matter which we charge upon him and fall into matter of Controverſie, that ſo they may drown the other, is not to the purpoſe; it is a Deviation from the Charge and the Method laid down, and a perfect violence offered to the Order we agreed upon. If *Tho. Hicks* pleaſe to appear in publick or not in publick, in a Meeting of a hundred or two of a ſide, or what number he pleaſes, as we conſent and think fit of, and begin with his Charge, and go through it from Article to Article, we freely conſent either in ſuch a Meeting to do it; or now, if *Jer. Ives* pleaſes; We will read the Charge and begin where the Charge begins, if he pleaſe to Eſpouſe it: But if not, for Men to come and ſay the Quaker owns this and diſowns that, and ſo fall a-picking of this particular and that particular out of the Charge; though this may be reaſonable where we conſent; but we do not, nor will not conſent to any ſuch thing. Beſides, we have conſented to a Method, and they have agreed to it, therefore I ſay if they will begin with the Charge, we have time before us. The day will afford us to go through a good part of it, and we will go through it, as convincingly as if ſo be *Tho. Hicks*, was here, but this I ſay we will not Baulk our Charge as we did at the *Barbican-Meeting*.

Jer. Ives. Whereas, *W. Penn* ſaith, that there was a Charge exhibited againſt *Tho. Hicks*, and if we will manage it Article by Article, they will go through it; and that they will not baulk it as they did at the laſt Meeting at *Barbican*, and that they were willing to diſcourſe it publickly or otherwiſe; this is the ſum I think of what you ſay. I add alſo, they Charge and Accuſe *Tho. Hicks* of Forgery and Lying. The Truth is, if it be as *W. Penn*, and *George Whitehead*

Whitehead ſaith of him, he is the Prodigie of the Age, for Lies and Forgery; but how true that is, will in the Iſſue appear; God willing, when *T. H.* and you ſhall agree of a Meeting for that purpoſe, which will eaſily be obtained, if you conſent to our Propoſals for the Regulation thereof.

But to take off the Edg of the Peoples minds in this matter. Let me ſay thus much at preſent, that I will ſhew an Inſtance in a Book wherein *VV. Penn* doth Accuſe *Tho. Hicks* of Forgery, that he hath there ſaid, that *T. H.* is a Forger for ſaying that you ſaid in your Book, Chriſt ſuffered only as our Example, ſay you the Word *only* is not there, therefore thou art guilty of Forgery.

Jeremiah Ives. Now I ſay the Word *only* is there, as I could readily make manifeſt if that were my preſent Task, and yet you ſay *T. H.* is a Forger for ſaying ſo; and at this rate, you may make all the World Forgers, if you ſhall ſay he is guilty of Forgery, for ſaying that is in your Book, which is in your Book, Intituled *Sandy Foundation.* Now I ſay, if I do not ſhow, that the Word *only* is there, then *Tho. Hicks* is a Forger, but if I do, then the Forgery returns upon thy own Pate, & thou haſt as much Reaſon to be ſuſpected in all the Reſt of the Charge.

VV. Penn. If *J. Ives* will begin here, I will abide by it, if God give me Life; and ſtand by that Word particularly, and *J. Ives* and I have the management of it all; but it is not fair for him to pick out things here and there, and yet I Charge *Tho. Hicks* with Forgery and Lying, and Slandering.

I remember how they Twiſted into us the other day, ſo that we were reflected upon by ſome for going beſide our Charge, as if it was firſt agreed upon to diſ-

discourse of matter of Fact, and then afterwards matter of Doctrine.

And therefore matter of Fact being the first Article of our Charge; It is not fair for an Enemy to Pick where and how he pleases, but take them as they lie in order, and defend himself as well as he can.

J. Ives. I am Deputed to attend your Motion, and as far as I shall Espouse any of the Articles of your Charge, I will Dispute them with you, and so far as I undertake any part of the Charge, *Tho. Hicks* shall be concluded by me; And here Mr. *Ives was Interrupted:*

VV. P. Wilt thou begin his Charge, or insist on that particular?

J. Ives. Pray hear me without Interruption, as I did you. The Instance I gave concerning *VV. P.* his Forgery, I shall not Insist now upon it (as I have told you) and if *VV. P.* had not reflected so severely upon *T. H.* in that particular, I had not mentioned it at this time. But now I say *VV. P.* is altogether beside the Method of the Articles, because Forgery is not the first Article in the Charge they sent to us, as we can show here, and we are content to go on and begin with the first Article here exhibited against him in this Paper you sent us, and I do here speak and say, in the Name of *Tho. Hicks*, and those Friends that are related to him, that as far, and as many Articles I shall discourse this day, I do here assure you in his and their Names, that he and they shall be concluded by it; but if there be any other Article relating to Witnesses and other particular matters; I say that must be referred to another time, wherein he shall give you

a

a Meeting and bring forth his Witneſſes and Evidences: and whereas he tells us that the Charge that was ſent only referred to matter of Fact, and not to matter of Doctrine and Controverſie. It is well known to be a falſe ſuggeſtion; but further I ſay, matter of Fact may become matter of Doctrine and Controverſy; and therefore Mr. *Penn*, that is a meer Evaſion and a Quibble upon the word *Controverſie*, as I will ſhew you; for if one Man ſhould Charge another for being an *Atheiſt*, or denying the True *God*, or, that he is a diſhoneſt and ſcandalous Perſon, all this I confeſs is matter of Fact. Now if he brings his Charge againſt this Man, and the Perſon doth not deny it, but freely confeſs it that he did ſay ſo of him, then I hope matter of Fact becomes matter of Doctrine and Controverſie; and he muſt bring his Proofs againſt that *Atheiſt* (*viz.*) that there is a *God*, &c. Now *T. H.* doth oppoſe the Chriſtian to the Quaker, and therein tacitely concludes that the Quaker is no Chriſtian; this is the firſt Charge againſt him: Now he either owns or denies he ſaid ſo of you, if he denies it, then it lies upon you to prove he hath ſaid ſo, (*viz.*) denyed you to be Chriſtians; but he doth not in the leaſt deny it, but freely and frankly confeſſes it (as he told you at the laſt *Barbican-Meeting*) that he hath in his Books ſaid, that which doth import or imply as much, that you Quakers are no Chriſtians, and not only he, but I do here ſay as much in words at length that you are no Chriſtians & by the Aſſiſtance of *God* I will prove it, Anſwer me who will, and this is to the firſt Article of his Charge whatever you ſay.

G. Whitehead. Firſt, Let the Articles be Read, that the people may ſee where the ſtreſs of the Charge lies, whether in oppoſing the Chriſtian to the Quaker,

or

or whether the ſtreſs of the Charge lies upon the whole Dialogue, which is to be underſtood a Diſcourſe between two, a Chriſtian and a Quaker, and yet made by *T. H.* and he declared at the *Barbican*-Meeting, that he owned the words, and he would not abate us one word of what he had written, whereby occaſion was given to many people to believe that it was a real Dialogue, when-as it was made, framed, and formed by *T. H.* And this is the matter we do intend to inſiſt upon that; That it is a Forgery, and fictiouſly done, and here is his Charge which relates to, and concerns matter of Fact; he doth not ſay it was writ Dialogue-wiſe, or that he doth propoſe it by way of Dialogue, as truly and moderately, Perſonating this or the other perſon, but he ſaith poſitively it is a Dialogue and a Diſcourſe between a Chriſtian and a Quaker, and yet it was made by *T. H.* But we ſay it was no Diſcourſe between two, here is the Charge; and he ſaith further, That he hath faithfully repreſented ſome of the chief, and moſt concerning Opinions of the Quakers, together with their Method and Manner of Reaſoning in the defence thereof.

Now we appeal whether this might not be underſtood by ordinary Capacities, that it was a real Diſcourſe, and yet we ſay it was contrived by *T. H.* with all the diſadvantage he poſſibly could Imagine, falſly perſonating and repreſenting us, our principles and practices, and that in the name of the Quakers *viz.* That the Quaker ſaid ſo, and that the Chriſtian ſaid ſo; and alſo in the Paper we ſent them we pointed them to the particulars in his Book, whereupon we placed our Charge, and that what concerns matter of Fact, was in the firſt place to be examined, and what concerned matter of Doctrine, to be afterwards diſcourſed,

courſe provided we had time, therefore herein doth the ſtreſs of this Charge lie, for Forging a Diſcourſe between a Chriſtian and a Quaker, when there was no ſuch thing, but it was made and contrived by *T. H.* alſo that he doth it in a very abuſive manner and this we are to prove by the ſequel of the particular Charges.

J. Ives. We ſay it again, that his firſt Charge is for writing a Dialogue, and oppoſing a Chriſtian to a Quaker; and his firſt Charge is not for Forgery.

Tho. Plant. Will you then *Mr. Penn* and *Mr. Whitehead*, acquit *Tho. Hicks* for oppoſing the Chriſtian to the Quaker?

G. Whitehead. That may come in at another time.

Tho. Plant. No, No, either acquit him now, or let it be diſcourſed at this time, according to that Paper you ſent to us, of the Articles exhibited againſt him, (as I have here to ſhow) this being the firſt Article of his Charge, for is not this the firſt Article of his Charge; for writing a Dialogue between a Chriſtian and a Quaker. *Anſwer, Anſwer?* the people *Cry Yes, Yes.*

W. Penn. We will do things in Order, the Charg is firſt to be exhibited, and then to be Proved, now the firſt hath been done, but *Tho. Hicks* denies it to be a Fiction, or a Forgery; therefore we muſt prove it to be ſo, and we are not to run to another matter, to prove another point, which how ever proper it may be in another place, it is not ſo here, and therefore here it is proper.

Here they offer to read the Charge.

Some Cry I, I, and ſome No, No,

J. Ives. Hear us first, the substance of what you have said, amounts to this, that you Charge him for writing of a Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker, which you say is fictitious, because he brings in the Quaker, speaking things that he never said, that is to say, abusing the Persons represented in the Dialogue. To this I Answer, as Mr. *Hicks* did the last time, this Charge supposes a Complaint against the manner as well as against the matter of his writings. First, the manner of writing, because it is a Dialogue, and so fictitious, because never any Persons talked so to one another. Now here is a Book written by one *Solomon Eccles*, which he calls a Dialogue between a Person that (he says) was Zealous for the Church of *England*, and by Profession a *Musician*, and a Baptist and a Quaker.

W. Penn. Read the Title.

T. Plant. A Musick Lecture or the Art of Musick, &c.

W. Penn. G. Whitehead. O, but this was written by way of a Dialogue.

J. Ives. Now I will shew you that this distinction by way of Dialogue, & a Dialogue, is but a meer Evasion, because they are Terms equivalent in such Methods of Writing; but I Answer further, the Quaker brings in the *Musician*, who is Zealous for the Church of *England* speaking thus, indeed our Ministers do love their Bellies too well to be Ministers of Christ, and they feed not their Flocks, but themselves, *&c.* Now I would ask *William Penn*, whether or no this be not a Fiction, or whether any persons Zealous for the Church of *England* ever said so.

W. Penn. There is thousands of the Church of *England* that a e for Preferment.

J. Ives

J. Ives. But What is this to the purpoſe? this is very impertinent, did any of them ever ſay ſo? If you do not prove that, you ſay nothing. I Challenge you to prove that any Zelot of the Church of *England*, either Miniſter or People, ever ſaid ſo of their Miniſters Indefinitly, as *Solomon Eccles* makes his Churchman ſpeak in his Dialogue.

W. Penn. Though thou art an Antient Diſputer, yet I ſay thou art an unfair and an Impertinent Perſon; Firſt unfair, becauſe inſtead of maintaining *T. H.* againſt our Charge, thou runs to parallel Caſes; we will ſpeak to thee, if thou wilt Anſwer for him. Secondly, Impertinent in this Caſe, for to write a thing by way of Dialogue, is to let the people underſtand that it was not a real Dialogue, but done in Imitation of a Dialogue; for by way of a thing is in Imitation of a thing, but now to ſay ſuch a thing is a Dialogue, is to aſſert that it was really a Dialogue, therefore we Charge *T. H.* with Forgery, for ſaying the Quaker ſaid ſuch and ſuch things that no Quaker ever ſaid, nor is it ſayable from a true Quaker according to his Principles, *&c.*

J. Ives. I will ſhew you the ſame here.

W. Penn. We will come to that hereafter, and if any Friend of ours, hath wrongfully repreſented any Mans Principles. Doctrins, Perſon, or Practices; we ſhall give a Teſtimony againſt that Man.

J. Ives. I would only ſay thus much, as to this particular, that thoſe that would exhibit a Charge againſt any for Writing of Dialogues, that they would begin at home, and cleanſe their own Houſe; I do not ſay we ſhould diſcharge any Criminal, who hath abuſed any Perſons in his Dialogue, or in any other way of Writing, becauſe you have done the like; but let

me tell you that for men to pretend to so much Justice as you do, in this particular, you of all Men should not take Licence to your selves, to represent Persons fictitiously, and bringing them in saying that which was never said, nor is sayable by them according to their Principles, the very same thing you accuse *T. H.* for; and therefore if you your selves are guilty in that very particular thing you accuse him of, you should purge your selves before you accuse him, for here is this *Solomon Eccles* representing a Church of *England* Man, saying that which he never said, nor is sayable by them according to their Principles.

W. P. We give our Testimony against such proceedings.

J. Ives. Then I say do Right to *T. H.* in this particular.

W. Penn. We will give our Testimony against any Book that is written by any of us, if it be Condemnable.

J. Ives. Why, what think you of *Solomon Eccles* Book, which represents three Men of several Judgments, discoursing Dialogue-wise; and let the Title be what it will, the Fact is the same, for he brings in Men saying that which they never said, nor is sayable by their Principles.

W. Penn. We will give you a Meeting as to that.

J. Ives. Therefore this I say, that this is a sufficient Answer to the Method of Writing, which is made part of the Charge against *T. H.* for if he hath falsyfied you in the matter of his Writing, (which comes next to be considered) he hath not in the Method, this is allowed him, supposing he doth not misrepresent and abuse the Person that he doth Personate) though before it was called by you Religious Romances, and an Idle way

way to represent serious matters by, but it seems the Quakers themselves can allow it, and take the same Liberty to write Dialogues; which they deny to others. Witnesse this Book of *Solomon Eccles*, &c. and his fictitious way of bringing in Men saying that they never said.

W. Penn. The Person is not here.

J. Ives. But his Book is here.

G. Whitehead. You have made an unequal Comparison, for we accuse *T. H.* for writing positively a Dialogue with all the disadvantages he possibly could against us, yet written by *T. H.* though he saith positively it was between a Quaker and a Christian; but now *Solomon Eccles* who is not here to Answer for himself, he is not so positive, but he may be understood by any ordinary Capacity, that he writ rather by way of supposition by his first Title, but also by the following words, wherein he saith, written by way of Dialogue and therefore we give this in as our first Charge against *T. H.* that he hath wronged the Quakers in making them speak those things that was never said, nor is sayable by any of them according to their Principles: and here the whole people of the Quakers are brought in; for we must understand, that the Question in the Dialogue is of all Christians, and so the Answer is of all Quakers, now he doth not suppose that this is the Quakers Answer, but he directly sets it down as their own words: now I appeal to common understanding whether here is not great disparity, between a Quaker writing a Dialogue between a Baptist and a Quaker, and writing in this manner. Here is a Treatise between two sorts of people, supposed or written by way of Dialogue, now if this be done in a sober and moderate way, we do not disallow it; that is, if it represents

But did Soloman Eccles represent the Church of England Man in his own words?

their Principles in their own words, but if so be a Baptist or other, should write and Print a Book, and say this is a Dialogue between a Baptist and a Quaker, representing the Quaker in such Methods and manner of speaking of their own Framing, that is false & fictitious; I do say here is a plain disparity. And suppose, that *Solomon Eccles* hath wrongfully represented a Man of the Church of *England*, or a Baptist, yet *T. H.* hath laid his Charge upon the Quakers in general.

J. Ives. I confess Mr. *Penn* spoke honestly, but this Man is full of Impertinencies and Tautologies, but such as it is, you shall have an Answer to it. Whereas he saith his Friend calls his Book, something writ by way of Dialogue, and doth not say a Dialogue, now I would desire Mr. *Penn*, to do us the Right, because it may better be taken from him than from us, to tell what is the English of this word Dialogue.

W. Penn. It is a Mutual Discourse between two or more, and so it is used in Scripture.

J. Ives. Why then here is a Book written by a Quaker called *A Discourse* between a Quaker and a Papist, it is not said by way of Dialogue, or by way of Discourse, (by which Evasion you have needlesly spent so much time to keep your selves off from the other business) but *A Discourse*, &c.

W. Penn. I say it was a real Discourse between two Persons, a Quaker and a Papist.

J. Ives. Then I require of you to prove it, that ever any Papist at some time or other, did give such a reply to a Quaker, as is there represented as parti-

particularly he brings in the Papist, saying thus, your Scripture is a false Scripture, which you mince and Clip, for in our Scripture it is said, *All the Fathers and the Patriarchs went down into Purgatory, and there lay till Christ came, and Christ went into Purgatory and brought all the Prophets and Patriarchs out of Purgatory, &c.*

W. P. Said, He would do that another time but not now.

The People Hooted, crying out, prove it, prove it.

W. P. This is not fair, that instead of Answering our Charge against *T. H.* the Cause of our coming, you make a Charge Extemporary against us, and give us no time nor Paper of that Charge, and now call us to prove it, and the Man is a hundred Miles off.

Tho. Plant. Mr. *Penn*, I am heartily sorry to hear you say it was a real Discourse or Dialogue.

W. Penn. I will give *Tho. Plant* a Meeting if he pleases, that we may maintain our Innocency in that Matter; and I do say that if any hath asserted that in their Writing that doth not become a Discourse or Dialogue, we will disown it; will *T. H.* do so? Let us read our Charge against him, and then we will prove he is a Forger.

J. Ives. I will consent to it upon condition you will afterwards come to the Disquisition of the first Article exhibited against him, which was for his writing a Dialogue which we are got over now, with respect to the manner, being both of us agreed as to the Lawfulness of it under those Limitations before mentioned. Now the next thing is, to consider the matter, which was in opposing you Quakers to Christians.

W. Penn. His first Article is for Forgery, as here you may see in our Papers of his Charge, and we will go upon that.

J. Ives. It is not in the Charge you sent us, but for writing a Dialogue opposing the Quaker to the Christian, and here I am to justify him in so doing, for you are no Christians; and I will prove you none, if you will hear my Arguments.

W. Penn. Since *Jeremiah Ives* hath told us, that he is here to maintain the Cause as it lies between *T. H.* and us, the people called Quakers, we desire our Charge (if he thinks fit) may be read now, which is as Reasonable as if *T. H.* was here, because *J. I.* Personates him.

J. I. I tell you we have heard it read already, but we will gratify you so far as to hear it Read again, if you will promise to hear my Arguments to prove you no Christians; but I say also, that you mistake and have forgotten what I offerred at the Beginning, I never told you that I would be concerned for every Article in *Tho. Hicks's* Charge, and I gave you my Reasons for it.

Some of the Quakers said, he did he did.

J. Ives. I Appeal to all the people, to do me that Right, whether or no I did not say, that so far as I reckoned any Article to be a Common Cause (as I did this) so far I told you I would be concerned for him, and I also told you, that I would undertake that *T. H.* and those that were related to him should be concluded by my Arguments. Nay, I told you further that if there was any thing in his Charge that was abstruse and of a more private concern, and that related to Witness, he shall give you a Meeting himself, and bring forth his Evidences, but at this time we are to

justify

justify *T. H.* not only for writing a Dialogue, but in opposing you to Christians which is your first Article against him: we say he did well in doing it; for you are no Christians, and I will (by the strength of God) prove it against the best of you if you dare.

Some of the Quakers side cryed out, there was no such word said as to Limit him in Personating *Tho. Hicks*.

J. Ives. I Appeal to the People, who cryed out *There was, there was.*

W. Penn. But not in such Terms.

J. Ives. To that signification.

Tho. Plant. *Mr. Penn*, what were the words?

J. Ives. Interposes and says, that his words were as he said before.

W. Penn. Said he was out.

The people cryed out they were his words, or to that purpose.

J. Ives. Now I say this being a common Cause, I am here to Justify *T. H.* for opposing a Christian to a *Quaker*.

I say you are no Christians, and I will prove you are none. Come will you hear your selves proved no Christians.

W. Penn. Thou understandest *Jeremiah*, what belongs to Discourse of this kind. Where a Charge is exhibited against a person, he either should deny or confess it.

Now we Charge upon *T. H.* not that he hath written a Dialogue only, but that this Dialogue is fictitious; he that writes a Dialogue and writes it fictitiously is a Forger, but so hath *Tho. Hicks* done, therefore he is a Forger; now it is my part to prove that he is a Forger: which is the first part of his Charge.

J. *Ives.*

J. *Ives.* Mr. *Penn* ſaith that I know what belongs to Diſcourſes of this kind, that if there be a Charge exhibited, it ſhould be either owned or denyed, it's True; and I confeſs there is a Charge here exhibited againſt *T. H.* both as for the manner and the matter of his Writing.

For the Manner we have got over that, That there is no fault in writing Dialogues, and now for the matter, which I ſay is his firſt Charge (as I have told you often) and that is for oppoſing a *Quaker* to a Chriſtian; now this he confeſſes, and therefore you need not go about to prove it, and we are here to defend him, and give our Proofs for it, that you are no Chriſtians; For if a Man ſhould ſay, ſuch a one is a Diſhoneſt Man, if he come to Charge this Man for ſaying ſo, if the Man denies that he ſaid ſo of him, then he is to prove (I confeſs) that he did ſay ſo of him; but if the Party confeſs it, that he did ſay that he was a Diſhoneſt Man, then it remains upon him to prove the thing, and to give in his evidences in ſome particular Inſtance, wherein his diſhoneſty appears: So we ſay, that *T. H.* ſaid you are no Chriſtians, this Charge we own; you need not prove it, but now we are to give our Reaſons why he and we ſay ſo of you: and here we Challenge you to Anſwer. Come, Come, you are afraid to Ingage in this point. It concerns the honour of your Religion to appear for Chriſtianity, if indeed you are Chriſtians, if you have any Eſteem for the Glory of God; appear for it now; the Cauſe now lies at the Stake. Therefore I ſay again, if you are Chriſtians appear now for Chriſt, if you are not, then *T. H.* ſaid true.

Here one Mr. Keith *a Scotch Quaker Interpoſes, and ſpends a great deal of time concerning an Argu-*

ment

ment between J. Ives *and himself, at the* Barbican-*Meeting; which at last Mr.* Penn *told them that was of private concernment; but the thing they come about was of publick: you say well saith Mr.* Ives, *and so they desisted.*

G. Whitehead. If we should explain the Intent of the word Christian, which he opposes the *Quaker* to, I say what Christian this is, it must be surely understood of an Anabaptist Christian, or a Christian Anabaptist.

Tho. Plant. We deny that; for there are more Christians than the Anabaptists.

G. Whitehead. It is the Baptist that is represented under the Term Christian, in opposition to the *Quaker.* Now our Charge is, to prove the Anabaptist to * to be no Christian, for he that Detracts, and bespatters, and belies other Persons, and in their own name represents them speaking that which they never did say, and represents their Principles & Practices in a way of Forgery, he is no Christian, but the Anabaptists; have done thus; therefore they are no Christians.

* There is not such a word in all the Charge.

J. *Ives.* Whereas *George Whithead* brings in *T. H,* as representing a Christian in opposition to a *Quaker,* to mean no more by the Word Christian, than the Baptist-Christian, I say Mr. *Hick's* is not so to be understood; for he means all Men that seriously believes in the Lord Christ, that was Crucified for the sins of Men, and is now ascended into Glory; they that believe this and conform to his Laws, where ever they live; We say they are good Christians, whatsoever Names or Appellations are given to them in this unhappy Age we live in: But I say whereas he brings his Argu-

Argument that some of the Baptists are no Christians that shall Calumniate or Traduce his Neighbour or speak fictitiously or otherwise evil of him; what is this to our present Case, which is this, we are accused for opposing you to Christians, and therefore it remains upon us for to prove you are none, now I say further, that *T. H.* did well or ill in thus opposing you, but he did not do ill, therefore he did well. *Answer this, Answer this.*

W. Penn. Offers as before, to prove *T. H.* a Forger, and therefore not a Christian.

J. *Ives.* This is no part of your Charge, there is not such a word in it, therefore I offer as before, to prove them no Christians, and that *T. H.* did well for so opposing them, and this is to the *Question.*

G. Whitehead. Jer. *Ives,* declares to the people that *T. H.* did not mean only the Anabaptists Christian, but all Christians in general, that believes in Jesus Christ; Therefore I do affirm that *T. H.* doth not only misrepresent us to the Nation, but he abuses us to all Christendome, or all that go under the name of Christians; because he hath Forged that in the name or Persons of all Christians that believe in Christ which was never the Christians words, nor representation concerning us.

W. Penn. Urges the same thing over again as before, that *T. H.* had abused them, and for this abuse was their complaint, and as for his Reasons to prove them no Christians, they were in Print, and it was for his Forgery that they desired Justice.

J. *Ives.* How shall I Answer, two together, Mr. *Penn,* consider what we propose to you and do not divert us with these kind of Impertinencies, for they are no better, for if *T. H.* or I can prove that you are no Christi-

Christians which I make no question to do, the Truth of it is, there is then very good Reason to believe that your professing of Religion and Christianity, and owning the Scriptures is all but out of Sinister ends, and all your sufferings are Idle and vain, and this may be the Reason why you deny a future State, for all these are the consequences of this Antecedent proposition, that you are no Christians,

W. Penn. What will you prove a Negative?

J. *Ives.* I that I will, let us therefore go to the question, and here I am in the presence of God, Angels, & Men, ready to prove it, or I will fall under my Arguments and the peoples Censures: Answer me if you dare.

W. Penn. I will prove the Book fictitious, and if I do so, then you are no Christians, and Consequently we are Christians.

J. *Ives.* That is false Logick, for that Book may be fictitious, and yet notwithstanding, you may be no Christians for all that.

Abundance of time was spent on both sides in urging the same things over and over again.

J. *Ives.* Undertake for your Religion now, and respond to my Arguments, to prove you no Christians, and I do promise you to sit down and to be no more concerned in the Disquisition of the Rest of the Articles between you and *T. H.* and when we have agreed upon a Meeting by Common consent, we will promise you to order it so, that *Tho. Hicks* shall be personally there to vindicate himself; but what a strange and prodigious thing is this to make such a stir to vindicate your selves and your own personal Credits and Reputations to prove *T. H.* hath abused you, and therefore is a Forger, and an evil Person, before you will vindicate the honour of God and your Religion; will you

seem

seem to be more concerned for your own personal Reputations, than you will for the Christian Religion, for shame do not: I therefore here Solemnly ask you before all this people whether you are Christians or no, if you Answer I, then I do say you are none, and will prove you are none; Answer me if you dare.

W. Penn. G. Whitehead, Read the Charge, Read the Charge.

J. *Ives.* I do oppose it, unless you will promise to come to the Disquisition of the first Article, as I said before, which is for opposing the Quaker to the Christian, if not, I will not give my consent; what are you afraid to come to it?

G. Whitehead. That is not the Charge, this is not that for which you were Appealed to, and Justice required at your hands; but for *T. H.* Writing a fictitious Dialogue, wherein he hath mis-represented us, *&c.* Now the *Quaker* in this particular, though he doth not exclude himself from being a Christian, yet I say in this particular he doth not affirm himself to be a Christian, so that is not the question.

J. *Ives.* No nor never will.

The people laugh and shout.

G. Whitehead. Why do you make sport for the people, now this I say, that it is *T. H.* that affirms himself to be the Christian; and therefore the stress of the Charge lies there, whether or no he be this Christian.

J. *Ives* There is never such a word in all the Charge as I have once and again told you.

G. Whitehead. Now I say, he is no Christian, and this we will prove, and when we have pursued our Charge, and fully examined every particular of it,

one

ne after another, then we concluded that matter of Doctrine shall come in by Course.

* *Yet they said at first, that their business was not to dispute matter of Doctrine and Controversie.*

J. Ives. You see what I said is true, that these Men will serve themselves first, and God afterwards; hey will first enquire, whether *T. H.* hath fairly dealt with them, or whether he hath abused them, and hen they will examine matter of Doctrine, whether hey be Christians or not; I say I will prove you none, hear my Proofs, hear my Proofs, are you Christians or no? *Answer me, Answer me,* I say you are Impostors, and Cheats, and I will make good what I say, by the help of God.

G. Whitehead. Jeremiah Ives represents us, as if we would first serve our selves, and then God; that we have more respect to our own Credits, than the Cause of God. I do here with a good Conscience deny it, and testify against *Jer. Ives*, as a false disingenuous Insinuator against us in this thing; we gave the Charge in respect to the honour of God and Christianity and the Reputation of Religion, we do not go about to vindicate our selves meerly as Men or Persons, that go under the name of *Quakers*, but we go about to Detect a Forger for abusing of us as Religious Persons.

J. *Ives.* He saith you are no Christians, and I say you are no Religious Persons, but a company of Impostors, and you *William Penn*, and *George Whitehead*; I say, I will prove that you are no Christians nor Ministers, but Cheats, and that you abuse the people.

W. Penn.

VV. Penn. That thing wherein we challenge *T. H.* for being a Forger, will also at the same time prove us * Orthodox, that is, good Christians, that hold the Christian Faith. I say, we shall prove our selves Christians and he no Christian at the same time inclusively; and we do not only bring in a Charge as Men, upon *T. H.* and fasten it here, but also as Christian-Men professing the name of God.

* *That will not follow; for it doth not prove you are Orthodox if he were a Forger and fictitious, for you may be Heretick for all that.*

J. Ives. But why do not you say professing the Name of Christ?

Here they offer to read the Charge, the other side opposed it, if they would not afterwards Discuss this whether they were Christians or no, which they said again was the first Article, the other denying it.

VV. Penn. I do here Challenge *Jer. Ives.* of Forgery in the name of *Tho. Hicks*, if *Tho. Hicks* be a Forger, then *Jer. Ives* is a Forger, for he personates *T. H.* and didst not thou know that I accused *T. H.* of Forgery in my writings?

J. Ives. I cannot tell whether you did or no.

At which they Laught.

J. Ives. You ask me whether or no I did not hear that you accused *T. H.* of Forgery in your writings at which there was some kind of Laughter made; but if you would hear me speak for my self, I think you would have no cause of Laughrer, unless it be that I have not conversed so much with his Books, or yours, which I have not read any thing in, so as to make observation of till last night.

VV. Penn.

W. Penn. Is this fair, to Condemn me before you read what my Judgment is?

J. Ives. But I have read enough between this and then to furnish me with Answers or Responses, and with Arguments to prove you are no Christians; but I Answer you further, that I did hear you charge him with Forgery since I came into this place, and made you this Answer, that you were more manifestly Guilty of it than he, for saying that the Word *Only* was forged by *T. H.* and that it was not in that place, when in Truth upon Inquisition I found the Word *Only* there, which you deny to be there, and I also tell you, that your charging him now with Forgery, comes in too early by several Propositions, for you know the first Charge against him, in the Paper you sent to us, was for writing a Dialogue, and opposing the Christian to the Quaker; and so Implicitely, saying you were no Christians. Now I tell you explicitely, that you are none; and that all your Ministers are a company of Cheats and Impostors: which Discourse we entred upon at the last *Barbican*-Meeting, and you consented to imbrace this Proposition, and we did not quite go through the Disquisition of it then, and therefore I think it very convenient to begin now, where we ended then; If not, let us dissolve the Meeting, and do not thus abuse the Auditory, for you know that Forgery was not the first Article.

W. P. It was the first Article.

A Stranger ſtands up, and makes a Speech.

GEntlemen, I ſay I am a Perſon very Indifferent, and no way concerned for either Part, I have been here from the beginning of this wrangling till now, and here hath been abundance of Diſcourſe, but nothing concluded. I ſuppoſe the whole Errour conſiſts in this, one would be Opponent, and the other would be Opponent; I do deſire to know, and I think it is the deſire of the whole Congregation, whether you are come to be Opponent, or whether theſe are come to be Opponents, which is Plantiff and which is Defendant; if you come to be Plantiffs, there is all the Reaſon you ſhould firſt propoſe, but if not, there is all the Reaſon in the World, that they ſhould have the priviledg of a Plantiff, that is to propoſe their Grievances, wherein they have been abuſed, and you are Defendants to maintain your ſelves.

J. Ives. You have diſcourſed diſcreetly, and I have nothing againſt it in the General, yet there is ſomething that was neceſſary for you to have had ſome previous Acquaintance of, before you had made this Speech, which I believe you had not opportunity to have, which is this, Suppoſe that you come and exhibit a Charge againſt me, perhaps that I have Traduced,

duced, and abused you, calling you dishonest Man, &c. Now I say in this Case it is very Reasonable, that you that are Plantiffs should Declare, or give a Narrative wherein I have Injured you, and then prove it; and it is most Rational, when you have so done, that I being Defendant, should make my Responses and Defences. But further, when you have charged me for calling you a dishonest Man, if I say it is true I did say so of you, I own the Charge that I called you so, & I am here ready to prove you are so; then I hope the Case is altered, and if I called you so, and can prove you so, I shall carry the Cause against you; this is our business. I will apply it to the Case in hand, they have exhibited a Charge against *T. H.* for writing a Book against them, and they Appeal to us for Justice. Which Charge was read at large, the last time, and we began with the first Article, which consists of two Parts. First, writing Dialogue-wise; Secondly, Opposing the Quaker to the Christian. As to the first, they have, I say, no Reason to be offended at the manner of writing, for I have Instanced in divers of their Friends for writing Books after this manner, and one called *A Discourse*, or *A Dialogue between a Papist and a Quaker*, for they say a Dialogue or a Discourse are *Synonymous* Terms, and signify the same thing in English, and that it is lawful to write in that manner, so that they do not traduce nor calumniate the Person represented, in bringing him in, saying things that were never said, nor are sayable by him with consistency to his own Principles; under these Cautions and Circumstances, they do conceive (they say) that Dialogues may be harmless and lawful, and if this Form and Method of writing be Lawful for them, I hope it may be as Lawful for us, thus far we

are agreed. We are come now to the matter of the Dialogue, and that is, that a Quaker is here Opposed to a Christian, Tacitly implying, and concluding that a Quaker is no Christian. Now we do acknowledg, and own this Charge, and we do not only speak it Implicitely as in the Dialogue, but we speak it here explicitely, and say, they are no Christians; and here it lies upon us to prove they are none. Now it is true, as you said at first, that if we deny that we opposed them to Christians, then it lies upon them to prove we did, they then being Opponents or Plantiff, and so make good their Charge; but we do freely confess the Charge, and own that we did so oppose them; for we say they are no Christians, and are come here to prove they are none, or fall under our Arguments, and your Censures.

Stranger. I conceive the Difference between you, lies in this, the first thing that you would have them be at, is to maintain themselves to be Christians, now *W. Penns* Answer to this is, (saith he) if you will let us proceed to the first Article, which is, that the Dialogue is fictitious, and so prove *Tho. Hicks* a Forger; then afterwards we will proceed and prove our selves Christians. Me thinks here is an easie Medium between you, for this being the first Article, that the Dialogue is fictitious, and so he that made it is a Forger; this they are willing to prove, and afterwards they are willing to Answer what Objections you have against their Principles and Christianity.

J. Ives. I say this is one part or piece of the Forgery that they accuse him of, to suppose and suggest that the Quakers are no Christians: now we do say it is no Forgery, for they are no Christians, and therefore how can it be Forgery to say they are none.

VV. P.

W. Penn. We are I say, the Plaintiffs, and the Persons agrieved, and therefore it is fair, we should prove our Charge that *Tho. Hicks* is guilty of Forgery.

J. Crook. I declare to the people this day that nothing my Soul desires more, than to come to that Point, whether we are Christians or no, only in order to that, I would know who is the Man that must prove us no Christians.

J. Ives. I will do it.

J. Crook. What, upon your own account, or in the room of *T. Hicks.*

J. Ives. In his stead.

J. Crook. I say he is no proper Person to do it, for he is *Illegalis homo*, and is guilty of Forgery, and therefore *non rectus in Curia.*

T. Plant. Mr. *Crook* I think you mistake your self, in what you have now said, for *T. H.* hath all manner of Liberty to proceed in the Dispute of that Question, whether the *Quakers* are Christians or no, and the Reason is this, because the *Quakers* have Appealed to the Baptists for Justice against *T. Hicks*; and this is the first Charge against him, that he hath written a Dialogue, and opposed the *Quaker* to the *Christian*; and this you know was managed the last Meeting; and the Baptists have called him to an Account for it, and he confesses matter of Fact, that he did write a Dialogue, and therein did so oppose them; and now we that are Baptists, that were Appealed to would know of *T. H.* the Reason why he did so oppose you; and as *Jos. Ives* doth here personate *T. H.* he is ready to give you the Reasons why you are not to be accounted Christians.

W. P. Upon what Account do you meet if it be not to prove the matter of our Complaint against *Tho. Hicks*.

T. Plant. W. Penn, Do not thus abuse the Auditory, for I will shew you here out of your own Book, that the first complaint against *Tho. Hicks* is for this thing, *viz.* For writing a Dialogue, and opposing the *Quaker* to a Christian, and therefore do not study Evasion; it is not only because under the Dialogue is couched Forgery, but also because he opposes a Christian to a *Quaker*, and therfore you called it one of his Scurrilous Invectives.

That *T. H.* should be the Man of all other, that should take upon him for to un-christian you.

Who is not only (as you say) unjust in doing so, but excessively Imbittered against you, and that leads the van of the Charge, (*viz.*) for writing a Dialogue between a *Christian* and a *Quaker*, and your great complaint against *T. H.* is for that he opposes a *Christian* to a *Quaker*: This is the first, both in your Book and the Charge, exhibited against him; and we own the Charge.

Another Stranger Stands up and Speaks to this Effect.

Gentlemen, I am neutral, and do speak what is equal: they are willing to prove T. H. *a Forger, & say it is the first Article agreed to be Discoursed this day, therefore it is reasonable they should go on to prove it, for if I am Plaintiff, you are to Answer my Accusation.*

J. Ives.

J. Ives. Forgery Sir, is not the firſt Article as you have heard once and again, and we have allowed them to be Plaintiffs, and our Defence lies in this, that if we prove them no Chriſtians, they were not injured by *T. H.* in that matter, and he will be Juſtified for ſaying or writing ſo of them; and this is not only the firſt Article, but it is that upon which we left off at the laſt Meeting, for want of time for the thorow Diſquiſition thereof, and therefore the more reaſonable to inſiſt on at this time, before we proceed to any thing elſe.

Stranger. Hear the Articles of the Charge read, that we may underſtand them.

Here the Quakers would have read their Charge, but it was refuſed by the other ſide, becauſe it was not the true Copy of what they had given under their hands and ſent in againſt T. H. *but the Baptiſts would have that Charge Read, and Mr.* Plant *had it in his hand for that purpoſe, provided the Quakers would begin where that Charge begun, which was ſent in under the Quakers hands, a Copy whereof was handed to them, which they owned to be theirs.*

Will. Ruſſel. I am ſuſpitious, that Gentleman that ſpoke, may be a Prieſt, or a Romaniſt at leaſt, and I have two Reasons for it.

Stranger. I am charged, and deſire to be heard.

W. Penn. Here is a Perſon Charged with what I believe to be falſe; but if it were true, it Argues a weak and feeble Cauſe, and malitious, to inſinuate as if we brought in a Jeſuit to help us in this matter.

J. Ives. I say what was said touching that Gentleman was but a suggestion, there was no more in it, and it was not by our Advice or Approbation that it was spoke; they were but his own words, and I have had as much suggested against me often-times, and the matter may soon be Issued by his being his own compurgator.

Stranger. I am no *Roman-Catholick*, that is, I am not of that Church.

J. Ives. But are you not a Hobbist, for you talk as if you were.

Stranger. I never read any of his Books.

W. Penn. Where is the Man that stands behind with his two Reasons, let him produce them.

Stranger. You have so much Evaded the matter intended by this Meeting, that it will not only be a means to make me, but others, turn *Quakers.*

T. Plant offers to speak, but *W. Penn* interrupts him.

W. Penn. What, must he not clear himself of what hath been charged upon him?

T. Plant. Answers the Stranger to this purpose.

Sir, I do not think you are a Jesuite or a *Roman-Catholick*, nor do I approve of what was said, I would not have said so of any Man, unless I knew it; but this I have to say, that if you should turn *Quaker* upon this, I should take you to be a weak and silly one.

Some offence was taken at this, and hereupon Mr. Plant further explains himself.

T. Plant. I mean if any should turn *Quaker* upon the Account of anothers weakness, he would be a pitiful weak *Quaker.*

W. P.

W. Penn. Call's again for the Man with his two Reasons, to shew what ground he had to believe the Stranger was a Papist, and further adds, that such words were enough to provoke the people to stone him as he went home.

Mr. John Nesbat in St. *Martins.* } What a Coxcomb is that!

Note, The Quakers in their Account of this Meeting, p. 41. *most falsly and malitiously tell the World that these words* (what a Coxcomb is that) *were spoke by a Baptist, now that this is no Baptist, nor never was, will appear by this following Certificate.*

I *Whose Name is here subscribed, do declare that I am the Person who spoke those words,* (what a Coxcomb is that) *in the Quakers meeting-Place near* Spittle-Fields *the* 16th. *of* October 1674. *and that I am not nor ever was a Baptist, and that the Quakers have lyed, in saying it was a Baptist that spoke them.*

Witness my hand,

John Nesbat Shoomaker
in St. *Martins.*

W. Penn, But where is the two Reasons to give for that suggestion, that the person is a Papist?

J. Ives. I cannot but observe, that upon a bare suggestion that a by-stander was a Papist, how earnestly the *Quakers* have once and again been pressing for the Reasons and Grounds of it, and what a deal of time they

they have ſpent in the purſuance thereof, though little to the purpoſe, or buſineſs of our Meeting; but when I have once and again not only ſuggeſted, but Aſſerted, that they are no Chriſtians, and that their Miniſters are Cheats and Impoſtors, how have they ſhifted and ſhuffled to decline the Diſcourſe of that matter; pretending it was not to the purpoſe, but upon a matter infinitely leſs to the purpoſe, being but a bare ſuggeſtion, and that alſo touching a ſingle perſon, how willingly have they fain to the purſuit of it and how earneſtly have they inſiſted to hear the Reaſons why one ſhould ſuggeſt the Stranger was a Papiſt; while they ſhewed an utter Averſation to hear Reaſons and Arguments offered to prove themſelves no Chriſtians.

Note, *That Mr. Ruſſel was willing at that time to have publiſhed his Reaſons for his ſuggeſtion, and did earneſtly deſire it; but Mr.* Ives, *and Mr.* Plant *and others would not ſuffer him to utter them for fear it would have prolonged the digreſſion which was too great before; by Reaſon of thoſe Strangers Interruptions. But his Reaſons have been ſince examined and found to be ſuch as might well Juſtifie his ſuggeſtion.*

J. Ives. I will prove out of ſeveral of your Writings that call your ſelves *Quakers*, that you are no Chriſtians, *&c.*

G. Whitehead. Becauſe ſome of our Friends have writ ſo, is it Reaſonable that we ſhould all be concluded by them, becauſe ſome of us have writ ſo, therefore to conclude, all are no Chriſtians, this is not fair; becauſe you your ſelves would not be ſo concluded, that becauſe ſome Baptiſts have denied the Divinity of Chriſt, the Immortality of the Soul, and the free Grace of God to all Men, that therefore all the Baptiſts ſhould be concluded no Chriſtians.

J. Ives.

J. Ives. I Answer to you first, this *Hypothesis* necessarily doth imply, some of you are no Christians; for saith *G. VV.* it is not Reasonable to conclude all are none, because some are none; for must all be concluded to be no Christians because some have written repugnant to Christianity: now I say, doth not this strongly and violently follow that some *Quakers* have been or are no *Christians*?

Secondly, I make this rejoinder further, That if this be true that some *Quakers* have written some things that the whole Body do not own, and yet are *Quakers*, & owned by you, that then there is not that Harmony among them that they make the World believe there is; for say they, if so be some of the *Quakers* have written those things that are not Reasonable and are not Justifiable, it is not fair dealing to apply it to them all, it plainly shewes, that either they are not all of one mind, or else, I say, it is fair to apply the sence of one to be the sence of all.

Thirdly, Whereas they say that among the Baptists some Men have denyed the Divinity of *Christ*, and the Immortality of the Soul, *&c.* Therefore it is not Reasonable from thence to conclude that all the Baptists hold so, or that they are therefore no *Christians*: I would give this Answer, That it is well known when any such opinions have been among the Baptists, that they have born their Testimony in Print, or otherwise against those Opinions: but now I do challenge the *Quakers* to shew me, when any of them have asserted any thing that hath not been owned by the whole, where ever they enter'd their protest against them: so that if the Books we Alledg be Books against which you have entred no Protest, we shall look upon them for as good quotations as any Book of ours under the same circumstances. *G. VV.*

G. Whitehead. Whereas he takes it for granted that I did conclude or Imply, that some *Quakers* are no Christians, and that they are not of one mind: I would have you take notice, the nature of what I said, I spoke *ad hominem*, and to shew them they did not according to the Rule of Doing as they would be done unto.

Secondly, I Argued from a particular to a General, and drew a Conclusion from the whole, from thence; supposing some *Quakers* did speak and write those things that we generally cannot stand by. I have brought them to this, that the Baptists themselves would not be so dealt by, though I do not know (I speak conscienciously) of any known Real-Quaker among us, that hath written and laid down, that is the Quakers Belief that we cannot stand by; and therefore I am far enough from making any such Hypothesis, that from thence any such Conclusion may be drawn, that the *Quakers* are no Christians; but it was to awaken them and bring them to this Consideration, so do as they would be done unto. Suppose these persons should produce some particular things out of some Books that we cannot stand by, (though I know not one) would these persons be so dealt with? but saith he (to excuse themselves) we have entred our Protest against them. Have the Anabaptists in general Protested against those that deny, or do deny universal Grace? and that deny the Death of Christ for all Men, that deny the Immortality of the Soul, that deny the Deiety or Divinity of Christ, as some of them have done, both by Argument and Books: Now if I did find that in some of their Books there were never known any general Protestation against by the Baptist in general, the paral-

lel

lel is equal; For if they would not be concluded by any Books against which there hath not been general notice, nor they have not taken any Cognizance of; I hope they will allow us the same priviledg: therefore suppose Books have gone out in the Name of *Quakers*, that were never owned by us, nay perhaps disowned, this I say is enough for us.

J. I. If as you say, you know no Books written by any you own for Real-*Quakers*, but what you can stand by; why do you decline to hear me prove you no Christians out of such writings, whose Authors are Real *Quakers*, and owned by you; and if you can do the like by any Baptist, we will hear you.

But unless you do this, your Reply is Impertinent.

W. Penn interposes, and another both together.

J. Ives. This is not fair; which I have observed practised often on your side of the way, that when one of you hath done making his Speech, then before I can give an Answer to him, another Interposes, which is very unreasonable; for you ought to have heard me out in what I could have rejoined to him, and then have made your Answer to me; for can you think I can hear and Answer two Men at once?

W. Penn. Let us prove the Forgery of *Thomas Hicks*.

J. Ives. I will refer that to the next Meeting, where he shall make his Personal Appearance himself, and I promise you not to enquire into this first Article then, whether you are Christians or no, if you will Dispute it now.

W. Penn. If *Jer. Ives* thinks he hath Lungs enough, and time to go upon that now, why not to go upon this Charge?

J. Ives.

J. Ives. I have already given you my Reasons of it, for there are many things in that Charge, that unless *T. H.* was here, I am not able to manage, though I had the Lungs of the best of you; for the Reasons I told you before, not being privy to many things which are depending upon Witnesses, *&c.* But there is some things I am privy to, and can manage; among which this is one, [for you take your selves greatly wronged, that he should oppose you to Christians] this I can and will manage against the best of you, that it is no wrong for you to be esteemed no Christians, for you are none; and I am the more earnest to debate this Proposition with you, because I would ease you of your business; and I assure you, as I have already told you, I will not mention it else-where; but if you will not dispute it now, you must expect to meet with it in another place.

W. Penn. We are not afraid to engage in this point with thee, for wee do believe in Christ Jesus as he is God, and as he is Man; that he was born of a Virgin, and that he Preached a Heavenly Doctrine, wrought Miracles, laid down his Life, is risen again, and ascended into Glory; Not only as God, but as Christ Jesus in the heavenly Manhood glorifyed; This I say, that we may not shew our selves backward and nice to debate this point here.

J. Ives. But you have shewed your selves unwilling all along, and though you have made a large Confession of your Faith; and it looks as if it was Orthodox, yet before all this people I my self will undertake to prove that it is nothing but Equivocation; for if I do prove you to be no Christians, then all these words are but equivocations, meerly fallacious and delusive, to accommodate your selves to your party, and

unto

unto the minds of the vulgar people.

W. Penn. Will you conclude in *T. H's.* or in your own sense?

J. Ives. In both, if you please.

People——*No, in your own.*

W. Penn. I would have you understand, that this is a condescention on our part.

J. Ives. A mighty condescention indeed to defend your selves to be Christians! I say, it is no condescention, when any Christians are charged to be Antichristian, or to be no Christians to leave any business to vindicate themselves to be Christians, therfore hear my Argument.

If *William Penn* be no Christian, then all that he hath said concerning his Confession of Faith in Christ is mere Equivocation:

But *William Penn* is no Christian;

Ergo, all that he hath said concerning his Confession of Faith in Christ is mere Equivocation.

Here *William Penn* withdraws, and substitutes *George Keith* a Scots-Man in his room, to defend his Cause; who seemed very Zealous and affectionate, and cryed out, he denied both *Major* and *Minor*. The people seeing him so fierce, and expressing his mind so hotly, fell a-laughing, at which *William Penn* desired them not to conclude any thing against him from his looks, for my Friend (saith he) is a Learned Man, and a fair Disputer; and thou shalt have enough of him *Jeremiah* before thou hast done.

J. Ives. William Penn is my Adversary, and you do (Sir) meddle with another mans business which is none of yours, and you rather Scold than Discourse; and I except against you also, because you speak in a Northern Dialect, and have not so strong a Voice as Mr. *Penn*, and I am some-what hard of hear-

ing,

ing, so that neither I nor the people will understand you so well as him.

George Whitehead. Will. Penn may as well substitute one in his Room, as for thee to Personate *Tho. Hicks.*

J. Ives. I Challenge *William Penn* and not him; besides *Tho. Hicks.* is not here, and *William Penn* is, therefore let him speak for himself.

George Keith. I will repeat *J. Ives* his Argument, which is this.

If *William Penn* be no *Christian*, then he is an Equivocator.

But *William Penn* is no *Christian.*

Ergo *William Penn* is an Equivocator.

Now I say, I deny both Propositions, *Major* and *Minor.*

J. Ives. Have you repeated my Syllogism Right? are you a Man fit to be Discoursed withal?

George Keith. Wherein have I mistaken thy Argument, I say I have not, for it was grounded upon a General Proposition.

J. Ives. Nay you have mistaken it, for you told the people that my Argument was grounded upon a general Proposition, when it is no such thing; therefore you do not fairly nor honestly, for it was grounded upon Mr. *Penns* particular Confession of his Faith, *viz.* that he believed in Christ as God and Man, and that he dyed for our sins and rose again, and ascended into Heaven; this was that I Argue upon. I Appeal to *William Penn* to be my Arbitrator in this Case, my Cause is so fair; for I did not say, If *William Penn* be no Christian that then he is an Equivocator, as Mr. *Keith* hath falsly suggested; for a Man may be no Christian, and yet it doth not follow from thence that

all

all he saith is Equivocation; but I Argued thus.

If *William Penn* be no Christian, then *This Confession* of his Faith in Christ is a meer Equivocation; But *W. Penn* is no Christian, *Ergo.*

G. Keith. I deny the consequence of your first Proposition.

It doth not follow genuinely, and I will prove it.

J. Ives. What a Respondent and offer to prove! but further, will you lay the stress there, and I will venture it.

G. Keith. No, No.

The people shout and hooted, and then Mr. Penn *offers to Interpose, and Discourse* with Mr. Ives.

J. Ives. Have not you referred your Cause to *George Keith*? I shall not admit you both, I will Discourse but with one at a time; but take his place and I'le Discourse it with you.

G. Keith. I am a fresh Man, and I will speak so that my Voice shall be heard, and I will Discourse with you for a pair of hours.

J. Ives. I, two pair of hours if you please.

Here two or three of the Quakers side Interpose together.

J. Ives. Is this fair? are you Men endowed with such extraordinary Inspirations as you pretend to, and dare not one of you undertake one Man, that doth not pretend to such extraordinary Assistances? hath not *W. Penn.* made choice of *G. Keith* to Dispute it with me? if so, let the rest be silent.

G. Keith. I deny the Consequence; it doth not follow, that if he be no Christian he is an Equivocator.

Here the Quakers side was in a great confusion, several of them speaking (very earnestly) all together;

J. Ives. What? two or three against one Man! what? half a dozen! you had best all speak.

The People shout and hoot.

Silence is commanded on both sides.

J. Ives. Mr. *Keith*, You are a Prevaricator, my Argument you abuse and I call for Right; and I Appeal to the People, whether or no, my Argument was not grounded upon Mr. *Penn's* Confession of his Faith, and so it was particular? whereas you tell the people it was General, which I say is false, for my Argument was this.

If *William Penn* be no Christian, then for him to make such a Confession of Christ as to his Birth, Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension (as he hath done) is meer Equivocation.

But *W. Penn* is no Christian.

Ergo.

Now Answer my Argument.

G. Keith. I shall Answer *Jer. Ives* his Argument; only, let me propose a Question, and then I will Answer his Question. I shall shew you my Answer to his Question, was Rational and Logical; for I know as well what belongs to Disputes as *Jer. Ives* doth.

J. Ives. So it appears.

G. Keith. I might, if I would, deny the first Proposition, or the second, or the most weightie of the two Propositions, according to the Laws of Dispute; for a Conclusion follows both the Premisses, it follows the weightiest Premiss, so that if either Premiss be false upon that account, the Conclusion is weak,

weak; so that I had Liberty to deny one or both Propositions; so that I conclude in denying both Propositions, and I do not lay the whole stress in denying the first Proposition, for I deny both; and therefore I begin with denying the first Proposition, and put you to prove it.

J. Ives. Mr. *Keith* denies the Consequence of my *Major* Proposition, and saith it doth not follow; Now I Appeal to any common understanding, for thus I Argued upon him against *W. Penn*, That if he be no Christian, then all that he hath said concerning his Faith in Christ, as to his Birth, *&c.* is meer Equivocation. Now Mr. *Keith* desires that this Consequence may be proved; Now I would fain know of you, whether or no this Consequence doth not Naturally follow?

For, Whosoever shall confess the Christian Religion with his Mouth, and at the same time is no Christian, doth but Equivocate when he confesses it.

But *Will. Penn* confesses the Christian Religion with his Mouth, and at the same time he is no Christian.

Ergo. He doth but Equivocate when he confesses it.

G. Keith. I deny the second Proposition, that he denies it in his heart.

J. Ives. I did not say so.

G. Keith. What is your Proposition.

J. Ives. Do you deny my second Proposition, and ask me what it is; you a Disputant!

'*J. Ives* repeats his Argument; If *W. P.* be 'no Christian, then this Confession of his Faith is Equi-'vocation; but *W. P.* is no Christian, *Ergo.*

G. Keith. I deny that, that Mr. *Penn* is no Christian; and that he denies the Christian Religion, when he confesses it.

J. Ives. This is an Evasion and not a direct denyal; but I proceed.

J. Ives. Whosoever doth not own *that* Jesus Christ which God hath sent, denies the Christian *Religion* at the same time he doth seemingly confess it, and so consequently is no Christian.

But *W. Penn* doth not own *that* Jesus Christ that God hath sent:

Ergo.

G. Keith. I deny that *W. Penn* doth disown *that* Jesus Christ that God hath sent.

J. Ives. I will prove he doth.

Whosoever owns *that* Jesus Christ that God hath sent, hath some Rule or other for his Faith and Practice in the Christian Religion.

But *William Penn* hath no Rule, neither one nor other, for his Faith and Practice in the Christian-Religion.

Ergo, He doth not own *that* Jesus Christ that God hath sent.

G. Keith. I deny that Proposition that *William Penn* hath no Rule for his Faith and Practice, *&c.*

J. Ives. If *W. Penn* hath any Rule for his Faith and Practice, *&c.* It is either the Scriptures, or Immediate Inspiration.

But *William Penn* hath neither the one nor the other.

Ergo. W. Penn hath no Rule for his Faith and Practice, *&c.*

G. Keith. He hath both; therefore I deny the Proposition.

J. Ives. I prove, First that he hath not Immediate Inspiration for his Rule, and then I will prove out of their own Books, that he denies the Scripture for the Rule of his Religion. First

First, That he hath not Immediate Inspiration for the Rule of his Faith and Practice, I thus prove.

If *W. Penn* hath any Immediate Inspiration for the Rule of his Faith and Practice, then he hath some certain evidence to give us of that Rule by which he may be distinguished from an Impostor or meer Pretender.

But *W. Penn* hath no certain Evidence to give us of that Rule, by which he may be distinguished from an Impostor or Pretender

Ergo

G. Keith. I deny that Proposition (*viz.*) that *W. Penn* hath no Evidence to give for his Rule; for he hath an Evidence for his Rule.

T. Iones. If *W. Penn* in his *Ministry* and *Preaching* cannot do any thing to Evidence the Rule of his Faith and Practice to be by Immediate Inspiration, but what may be done by an Impostor, then it is much more true, that *W. Penn* hath no Evidence for the Rule of his Faith and Practice by Immediate Inspiration as a Christian.

But *W. Penn* cannot do any thing as a Minister, to Evidence or prove the Rule of his Faith and Practice by Immediate Inspiration, but what may be done by an Impostor.

Ergo, It is much more true, That he hath no Evidence for the Rule of his Faith and Practice, as a Christian, by Immediate Inspiration.

G. Keith. I deny that Consequence, for all this Argument proves is, that *W. Penn* is no Minister of the Gospel, but that is not to the business; he is to prove that he is no Christian. I will not undertake to prove and defend *W. Penn's* Ministry now, that we will leave to another time; but that he is a Christian,

and it doth not follow, that because I cannot Evidence nor prove my Mission from the Lord, as to my Ministry, that therefore I have not my own satisfaction and inward perswasion of it in my own heart; and I say also, this is a Transition to another point, viz. from being no Christian, to not being a Minister of the Gospel; and I say, many may have the Inward Perswasion of their own hearts that they are Christians, though they cannot give any outward Evidence of it; therefore I deny the Consequence, it doth not follow.

J. Ives. Will you *please to repeat, and tell* me what the Consequence is you deny? Mr. *Keith stands still a little while and pauseth upon it.*

G. Keith. Do you repeat it *Jeremiah.*

J. Ives. Why! do you deny my Consequence and do not know what it is.

The people Laugh and Shout.

G. Keith. I suppose I know it; If *W. Penn* be a Minister, & cannot Demonstrate it to others, that he hath Immediate Inspiration, then he is no Christian; but I say he may have the inward perswasion of his own mind.

J. Ives. Hold, I Argued from the greater to the less, *A Majori ad Minus*; If so be that *W. Penn* hath it not as a Minister, certainly how can he have it as a Christian?

G. Keith. But every Christian is not a Minister.

J. Ives. But every Minister is a Christian; and if *W. Penn* cannot give any Evidence as he is a Minister, for to shew he hath a Rule for his Faith and Practice in Religion by Immediate Inspiration as he pretends; how can he be able to do it as a private Christian! but I will take your distinction of a Minister and a Christian, and proceed upon it; and I will prove that *W. P.* hath not any Rule for his Faith and Practice, by Immediat Inspiration as a Christian.

If

If *W. Penn*, hath any Rule for his Faith and Practice, by immediate Inspiration as a Christian, he can give some Evidence of that Rule, by some thing that will distinguish him from an Impostor, or a mere Pretender.

But *W. Penn* cannot shew any thing to Evidence the Rule of his Faith and Practice by immediate Inspiration, that can distinguish him from a Pretender or an Impostor.

Ergo.

I have come thus far by a Progression of Syllogisms; and my Argument now is reduced to this pinch; That if *W. Penn* hath any immediate Inspiration for the Rule of his Faith and Practice, then he hath something by which he can Evidence to himself and to us, that he is no Impostor nor pretender to the Spirit for this Rule.

But he hath nothing by which he can Evidence this to himself nor to us.

Ergo.

And you may the better Argue this point with me Mr. *Keith*, because you have the Advantage, having written a Book lately, (if I am not mistaken) of immediate Revelation; and therefore I lay, Whosoever pretends to immediate Revelation for the Rule of his Faith and Practice, ought to have something to Evidence, this pretence by which he may be distinguished from mere Pretenders and Impostors.

But you and *W. Penn*, have not any thing to distinguish you from Pretenders and Impostors.

Ergo, Neither you nor he have any immediate Inspiration for the Rule of your Faith and Practice.

G. Keith. I am to defend the Person of *W. Penn* and not *George Keith*; another time I will undertake either in publique or private, to vindicate my self; but

as for the present I shall not, it not being my task to vindicate my self, therefore you ought not to put this upon me.

The people shout.

J. Ives. How now! have you undertaken to be *W. Penn's* Advocate, and will you not own the Cause? But however, if you will not Answer in the person of *George Keith*, Answer in the Name of *W. Penn*, and proceed: for I have brought you to this pinch, That you must shew us some Evidence, by which you may be distinguished from mere Pretenders and Impostors. But if you cannot, it follows plainly, That you are so your selves; therefore the Point now is not whether he be a Minister, or whether he be a Christian by inward perswasion of his own mind; but what Rule he hath for his Religion by immediate Inspiration, and what Evidence he can give of it.

G. Keith. I distinguish on the first Proposition, he that affirms this as a Truth to be received and believed that he is a Christian, he ought to give some Evidence he is so; but now *W. Penn* doth not impose it upon others, nor hath any call from the Lord to impose it upon others; and to require others to believe it that he is a Christian, and hath immediate Inspiration; and it is enough if he is perswaded in himself though he cannot Demonstrate it to others.

Mark Reader, *Here G. K. gives away the Cause, for he saith* Will. Penn *doth not impose it upon others, nor hath any Call from the Lord to impose it upon others, or Require others to Believe that he is a Christian and hath immediate Inspiration*, &c. *Surely, if this be true it is no Crime for* Mr. *Ives to say he is no Christian, and that he hath no immediate Inspiration for the Rule of his Faith and Practice.*

And may not such Men be rejected as Impostors out of their own Mouths? for if he have no Call from the Lord to require

Men

Men to believe he is a Christian, as G.K. *saith, then surely he hath no Call from the Lord to require Men to believe he is a Minister of Christ; but* George Keith *says* William Penn *hath no Call from the Lord, to require Men to believe he is a Christian,* Ergo, *It followeth, he hath no Call from the Lord to require any to believe he is a Minister, and therefore without Sin may be rejected as an idle Impostor.*

J. *Ives.* I will shew you how you have given us a pittiful go-by, for I hope my Argument sprung from the Rule of Faith and Practice; He that hath no Rule for his Faith and Practice, *&c.* And not from a private perswasion in his own mind touching his sincere Obedience to a Rule; and therefore I must tell you That this is not the Question, what *VV.* Penn may be perswaded of in his own mind concerning his sincere Adhesion to that Rule. The question now is by way of Evidence and Demonstration to this people: and it is a Maxim in the Law, That which appears not, is not, therefore I say; If either *VV.* P. or *G.K.* have any immediate Inspiration, for the Rule of their Faith and Practice, as they pretend to, they must have something or other to Evidence this, to distinguish them from mere Pretenders and Impostors.

But they have nothing to Evidence this Rule or Guide, either to themselves or others, any more than what a mere Pretender and Impostor can shew.

Ergo.

G. K. As to the Maxim, That which appears not, is not; it is I confess true in some Cases, but it is not universally True; as for example, there is now a great War in *Holland*, it doth not appear to me whether the *French* have won, or the *Dutch* have won; and therefore I will conclude neither have had it, because it doth not appear: and therefore I deny it holds true universally, but it admits of many Limitations.

J. *Ives:*

J. *Ives.* Hear my Answer, He grants half, and so my burden is the lighter; in many Cases (he saith) it is true, That which appears not is not.

Note, But it might further be Answered, that the Maxim is true in all Cases in matter of Evidence about which the Maxim in Law is used; for it doth not appear who had the best, the French *or the* Dutch, *therefore it is not Evident. In like manner it appears not that you have a Rule for your Faith and Practice by Inspiration, therefore it is not* viz. *it is not Evidenced. In all such Cases, the Rule holds, That which appears not is not.*

J. *Ives.* But you may remember that our Argument is from a Rule of Faith and Practice, and not from an Enthusiasm of a man's own mind, but from what is to be Evidenced and Demonstrated; for it is a Disquisition in a publick Auditory; now *W. P.* is in a publick Auditory, and we are here to Pro and Con, to Argue and Answer; so that we must talk Intelligibly.

If the greatest Impostor in the world should come and tell you a Story, are you bound to believe it, because he saith it? now I say, what Evidence have you for what you pretend to, more than this? I am to prove you no Christians, I thus Argue; all Christians have some Rule for their Faith and Practice; you have none: You say you have; I say, It must be either immediate Inspiration or Scripture; you say both: and I say you have neither; I am now upon the first, to prove you have not immediate Inspiration for the Rule of your Faith and Practice; for whosoever pretends to that, must give some Evidence to justify this pretence, more than what a mere Impostor and Pretender can do; but this you cannot do.

G. Keith. If outward Evidence, then I deny.

J. *Ives,*

J. Ives. If there be no outward Evidence nor Demonstration, then it is impossible an Impostor and Cheat should be distinguished from one that hath a Real Divine Revelation, and Inspiration from Heaven; because he pretends to as much inward sincerity as the best of you.

G. Keith. Though he hath no outward Evidence, he may have an inward Evidence.

J. Ives. You told us before, he had some Evidence for the Rule of his Faith and Practice, when you denied my *Minor* Proposition; and now you say he hath no outward Evidence, but he may have an inward Evidence.

Note, *If this be true that* G. K. *saith, that* Will. Penn *hath no outward Evidence that may have an inward, then it seems it is more than* G. K. *knows, whether he have any Evidence at all for the Rule of his Faith and Practice by immediate Inspiration, which he hath been all this while endeavouring to defend, and to make us believe he hath in his Answer to* Mr. Ives *his Arguments; and yet now he saith* Will. Penn *hath no outward Evidence, but may have an Inward Evidence,* &c.

J. Ives. Answer me.

G. Keith. I deny that such a Man is not a Christian, because in a way of Reasoning he cannot prove it, &c.

J. Ives. Our business is not to require him to prove himself a Christian, but to give an Instance, by which he may Evidence his Rule of Faith and Practice by Inspiration; therefore Answer my Argument and deny what part of it you will, and do not discourse after this loose Rate, but tell us which part you do deny, for I question whether you have any Evidence. Deny which Proposition you will.

G. K. If I distinguish, it is enough.

J. Ives.

J. Ives. What is your distinction?

G. Keith. He that is a Christian he ought to have the Evidence of it in his own heart, and also, to go further, *viz.* to Demonstrate it by a good Holy, Sober. Righteous Life; but that he who is a Christian ought to give further Evidence of it to the World, either by Miracles or by Argument or Reason, this I deny; and I say, there are many good Christians, who cannot by Miracles nor by Reason prove themselves Christians.

J. *Ives.* You are a-Preaching, and not Arguing; we are Talking of immediate Inspiration for a Rule of Christian Faith and Practice, and not about those inward Dispositions of the mind, to obey that Rule: now how can any thing be a Rule for a Christians Faith and Practice, that is evident to no body but only to him that faith so?

G. Keith. Every Christian is to have it within him, and this is sufficient; if he doth not Impose it upon others to believe it, that he is a Christian, *&c.*

Note, *The Men are angry when Mr.* Ives *says, they are no Christians, and they have been all this while endeavouring to defend themselves to be Christians; and yet when they are brought to a pinch, they tell us once and again, they do not desire us to believe they are Christians; and that* Will. Penn *hath no Call from the Lord to require others to believe he is a Christian: This is the truest Doctrine that ever they taught, and we all believe it.*

J. Ives. Hold, we are well enough; then this must be evidenced to be somewhat different from an Impostor, and Deceiver; where is the difference, give an Instance.

G. Keith. In its own Nature it is different.

J. Ives.

J. Ives. Give an Instance, give an Instance; for in your sense any Impostor may have it, for if you should go to the professors of *Mahometism*, or *Muggleton*, they will all tell you they have an inward feeling within themselves, that they have a Rule for their Religion, but this is no Evidence; where is the Evidence to the People? speak to the thing, and give us some Instance. I challenge it, my Argument you know calls for it; shew me what Rule you have for your Faith and Practice by immediate Inspiration more than what an Impostor can shew, *an Instance, an Instance.*

G. Keith. My work at this present is neither to prove my self nor *W. Penn* to be Preachers or Ministers of the Gospel, nor to prove our selves to be Christians.

The People Laugh and Shout.

J. Ives. Why, what have we been Disputing all this while for?

Come an Instance, an Instance, for my Argument calls for it.

G. Keith. Why do you make sport for the people? I tell thee *Jer. Ives,* you are more fit to be a Stage-Player, than a Disputer; I do not, I say, decline this to prove my self or *W. Penn,* to be Ministers of the Gospel or to be Christians, when it cometh in its proper place; but it is not the thing that I am ingaged in at the present time; for my work at present is to respond, and not to prove; to defend our selves to be Christians: he is to prove *W. Penn* to be no Christian, and I am here ready to Answer his Arguments. To prove a Man to be no Christian is one thing: but to prove a Man to be a Christian is another thing; and I say farther, if I have an Evidence within my self that I am

a Christian, it is enough though I cannot evidence it to others.

J. *Ives.* Do you pretend to be a Disputant and run *Retrograde* in this manner? you must know that my Argument Issues in this, That whosoever hath a Rule for his Faith and Practice by immediate Inspiration, must be able to give an Instance whereby to distinguish him from a Cheater and deluder; now this Instance we require of you, therefore give it us.

For you mistake if you think we are now putting you to prove your selves Christians any otherwise than all Respondents may be said tacitly to prove the Truth of any Proposition, by Answering what the Opponents Object against it, and taking off the force of what is Argued.

G. Keith. We are not bound to give an Instance to every one.

J. *Ives.* Then I shall Conclude you have none, and we have done enough; for they will not you see give us an Evidence to prove they have a Rule for their Faith and Practice by immediate Inspiration.

Will. Penn offers to Interpose, and take Mr. *Keiths* place.

J. *Ives.* You are not to speak; for I will not hear you now; time was (you know) when I would, come *G. Keith* an Evidence, an Instance how you do distinguish (to this people) your selves from Cheats and Impostors.

The people Laugh and Shout extraordinarily.

G. Keith. Do not oppress me because I am a Stranger, and being so, I ought to be more Civilly Treated than if I was a Citizen or an *English* Man; but I am no *English* Man, therefore I say your Civility as Citizens should oblige me, and should be more fair to

me

me than if I was an *English* Man.

J. Ives. An Instance, An Instance.

G. Keith. This I offer to give as good Evidence and Proof of *W. Penn*'s Christianity, as any of you Baptist's shall give of your Christianity.

J. Ives. Hold, hold, that is very good, *&c.*

G. Keith. I say, if I offer to give as much Evidence that we are Christians, as you Baptists can give that you are Christians, but I hope we can give better Evidence to the World that we are Christians, than you can give; but it is enough if we can give as much; and I also say, that no External Evidence is required but a good outward Christian Conversation, besides that inward Evidence from the Spirit of God according to these sayings of the Apostle; He that believes hath the Witness within himself, and I have this Witness within my own self; the Holy-Spirit of God, that I am a Christian, and this is enough.

J. Ives. You tell us that you have as good Evidence for your Christianity as we have: now I Answer in the First place;

That I am glad we have the honour so much as to come in equal Ballance with you.

Secondly, I say that if we have not such Evidence, we do not tell you that the Rule of Christian-Faith and Practice depends upon immediate Inspiration.

G. Keith. Nor we neither.

Reader, Note *this, That* G. K. *hath all this while been endeavouring, as well as he could, to defend this Proposition* (viz.) *that* W. Penn *hath a Rule for his Faith and Practice, by immediate Inspiration, and now when Mr.* Ives *tells him that the Baptists do not pretend to immediate Inspiration for the Rule of their Faith and Practice, he Answers,* Nor they neither.

J. *Ives.*

J. *Ives.* Pray hold; you laid it upon both at first, and I told you, you had no immediate Inspiration for your Faith and Practice.

Now in your Answer, you plainly tell us you have none; contrary to what you said all this while; and then talk of the private perswasion of your own minds, of your being Christians; that's not our Medium we are upon, for we are upon this Medium, The Rule of a Christians Faith and Practice; and from thence my Argument Issues: and I say then, If you can give no Instance for the Rule of your Faith and Practice by Inspiration, but what can be given by an Impostor that opposes you, then there is no Reason to believe that you have such a Rule: but if you can, then give us that Instance.

G. *Keith.* We do not impose upon you, that you should believe we are Christians.

The people Laugh and Shout.

J. *Ives.* You see the Reason why the Quakers are so unwilling to hear themselves proved no Christians.

Mr. *Penn* Interposes, and Mr. *Whitehead* and a third, but Mr. *Whitehead* more especially.

J. *Ives.* Pray Mr. *Penn* be silent, pray Mr. *Whitehead* hold your tongue, you are not to speak; it is not your turn, you know it's contrary to your Agreement, who meddles on this side?

W. Penn. I perceive the matter lies here——

J. *Ives.* Mr. *Penn* you are not to speak, I will not allow it, where is G. *Keith?*

G. *Keith.* I am satisfyed for my own part; for I feel the Lord to be my help; but I say I do deny that I ingaged for my Friends, or they for themselves, that that they should not speak; therefore if my Friend

George

G. Whitehead, hath any thing preſſing upon his Spirit, he ought to be heard.

J. Ives. Not at all.

The People Laugh and Shout.

Mr. *Penn* and Mr. *Whitehead* both Attempt to Interpoſe.

J. Ives. No, No, I will not allow of it now, nor never will; to Ingage with ſo many. Surely you intend to make an End of me! It is not fair.

G. K. I do ſay, *Jeremiah Ives's* way of Proceeding is not Reaſonable, and it varies from the true way of Diſputation; for, inſtead of proving us no Chriſtians, he requires us to prove that we are Chriſtians; now I ſay, theſe are two different queſtions.

Mr. *Penn offers to Interpoſe.*

J. Ives. Why do you offer to Interpoſe? you ſhall not.

Yet he doth Interpoſe; but what he ſaid, by Reaſon of the Peoples extraordinary Shouting and Hollowing, it could not be heard; they crying out againſt the Quakers, *you are gone, you are gone, you cannot get out of it.*

J. Ives. W. Penn, I do Appeal, I do Appeal.

W. Penn. Why do not you ſilence the People now?

Tho. Plant. I have endeavoured, and I can do no more than I have done, I have gaped till I am tired.

W. Penn. I only ſay this, as to this Method of Diſputation, probably, to Reflect no Ignorance upon any Man here; for I think him no leſs a Chriſtian and an underſtanding Man, as to the Natural Parts of Wiſdom and Underſtanding, becauſe he is not verſed in the ways of Diſputation thus; for there are certain ways of Diſputation, *&c.*

J. Ives. Is this as becomes a Scholar and a Christian, To be against Arguing Scholastically? When G. W. made the first Syllogisms that were made to day; and G. K. hath proceeded to respond to Syllogisms, till he can respond no longer; and now you complain of them: But why do *you* speak Mr. *Penn*?

G. K. Why may not any Friend speak, if he have a pressing upon his Spirit?

J. Ives. Are you thereabout? I Appeal to all this Auditory; Whether I did not at first desire, that *W. Penn* might be my Respondent, because I personally accused him, and therefore it was very fair, that he particularly might respond, rather than that Gentleman; because I said, he spoke in a Northern Dialect and low Voice, and I somewhat Deaf; and therefore he would not so easily be understood as the other: but he recommended him to us, for a fair Disputant; thereupon I joyned Conference with him Personally, upon condition, that He and I should have the Discourse to alone; and by the same token, he said he would Discourse a pair of hours with me, and further that *W. Penn* told me, I should have enough of him before I had done.

W. Penn Interposes, *come to the Point.*

Stranger. You see the point, and you see you are pinched by it, and that makes you so concerned; therefore be silent, and you do but honestly to be silent.

G. K. A Dumb Man may be a Christian, and yet not able to Evidence his Christianity by words, as I said before.

J. *Ives* I do say that was not Instanced in before.

W. Penn affirmed it.

J. Ives.

J. *Ives.* But I did not hear him mention it, and so said several others.

G. K. A Dumb Man may be a Christian, and have an inward Evidence of it, and not able to give an outward Evidence by words.

J. *Ives.* That you do abuse me, I Appeal to all the People, my Question is not what Evidence even Children in their minority, before they come to the use of Reason, may have of the Love and favour of God; neither is it of Fools nor unintelligent Persons, nor of Dumb Men; My Argument is this, and therefore do not prevaricate; it Issued (I told you) from a Rule of Christian Faith, and Practice; It is either by Inspiration or Scripture; If by Inspiration (now I am speaking to *VV. Penn*) give an Instance, for he is not a Dumb Man. And I am not to be Evaded by a particular Instance of a Dumb Man, for my Argument, I tell you again, Issues from a Rule of Faith and Practice, and that must be either by Inspiration, or Scripture; and I am speaking to *VV. Penn*, and I hope he is no Dumb Man: I do not deny, but a Dumb Man may be a Christian, but what is that to *VV. Penn's* Rule for his Faith and Practice, by immediate Inspiration?

The People Laugh and Shout.

J. *Ives.* Mr. *Keith*, Mr. *Keith*, I do Appeal to all this Auditory, Whether or no, our Question was, that a Dumb Man, or a Blind Man, could give any Evidence for this, and the other thing? My Argument at first was directed particularly to *VV. Penn*, to prove him no Christian.

They of the Quakers side cryed out and said, that was a mere Evasion of what Mr. *Keith said.*

J. *Ives.* Now if you please to hear, I tell you, I have run my Argument to this head, that it remains upon you (for all you are pleased to tell us, that it is not proper for a Respondent) to give an Instance.

And I say, I may drive a Respondent to an Instance, Especially, when the Argument requireth it, and then you ought to give an Instance.

G. K. I have of a Dumb Man.

J. *Ives.* But I Answer thereto, That your Instance is impertinent; For, is a Dumb Man an Instance, that *W. Penn* hath a Rule for his Faith and Practice in the Christian Religion, by immediate Inspiration? you must therefore instance in some thing, to Evidence this Rule to be from Heaven, more than a bare pretence; or else *Mahomet*, or *Muggleton* may as well be believed as you.

G. K. I Answer, We can give as much inward Evidence for immediate Inspiration, as any of you can give.

J. *Ives.* What is an inward Evidence to me, or this People? or you that plead for *W. P.* besides, you may soon have as much Evidence as we, for immediate Inspiration; for we never pretended to it, as a Rule for our Faith and Practice, in the Christian Religion.

G. K. I say, I stand upon equal Ground, with any Anabaptist in the World.

J. *Ives.* I thank you for your love, that you will admit us to stand upon equal ground with you; but what is this to the Instance required? To demonstrate your immediate Inspiration to be from Heaven.

G. K. I do not say, that I do not stand upon better, but upon as equal as any of you all; and whatever outward Evidence any Baptist can give, that they are Christians, I say, I can give the same; but I

have

have given you a particular instance, which overthrows the Universal: for all his Arguing lies upon this bottom; Every Christian ought to give an outward Evidence of his Christianity, that is, he is a Christian by Words and Discourse; if that be his meaning I deny it, for a Dumb Man cannot, though he hath the exercise of his Reason, and is a good Man; yet he cannot give any Evidence of it by words and Arguments; though he can by a Holy and good Life.

J. *Iver.* You have prevaricated from the scope of the Argument, and Answer impertinently, as I have often told you; for the Design of my Argument was not to prove, that Men could not be Christians without extraordinary External Evidences; no, no; I know that the inward perswasion of a Mans own mind, touching his sincere Obedience to the Rule of Christian Faith and Practice is one thing, and the Rule for his Faith and Obedience is another.

G. K. It was about Persons not things.

J. *Iver.* I deny it.

G. K. Is not G. W. W. P. G. K. Persons?

Tho. Plant. But it is about things now.

J. *Iver.* I do desire you to give me an Evidence, how I may know whether your immediate Revelation for the Rule of your Faith and Practice, is from Heaven or from Hell.

Note, *And this Rule ought to be Evidenced to be from Heaven Antecedaneously to the Observation of it. Now if* W. Penn *hath a Rule for his Faith and Practice in the Christian Religion by immediate Inspiration, let him give us some Evidence of such a Rule, and we will take his word for the Observation of it; for it is the first of these and not the latter, that* Mr. Ives *hath Argued for, though the Respondent hath often Extravagantly Answered to the Latter.*

G. K. That is not my Task at present.

J. *Ives.* Then you have abused the Auditory, for you made them believe it was your business to defend immediate Inspiration. Therefore not a word more, we have done enough.

W. Penn. Take Jer. *Ives* place and I will proceed with thee *Tho. Plant.*

Tho. Plant. No, No, our Time is our already.

W. Penn. A few words ——— about the Martyrs in Queen *Maries* days, that they had the inward Testimony of the Lord within them, and they could not dispute for their Religion, yet they could burn and suffer.

Jer. Ives. But they were no Quakers.

The People laugh, and here the Baptists withdraw.

Note *Reader, how these Men can own the Martyrs in Queen* Maries *days for Christians, and yet in these days own none to be Christians but themselves, is a Paradox; but further did the Martyrs in Queen* Maries *days, pretend to immediate Inspiration for the Rule of their Faith and Practice? if not, What a grand piece of Impertinency is it to name them upon this occasion, who pretended to no other Rule for their Faith and Practice than the Holy Scriptures? and their Consciences were perswaded of the Authority of them, and for their sakes they loved not their Lives to the Death; and had they lived in our days, would haste run the same hazard (if called thereunto) to oppose Quakerism, as they did then to oppose Popery.*

READER, Here follows a Letter sent to me, by the Person who took the Dispute at *Wheelers-Street*, Octob. 16. 1674. in Short-Hand.

Mr. Plant,

I *Have according to your desire, Transcribed a Copy of the Discourse that was between* J. Ives *and* W. Penn, G. Keith, and G. Whitehead *in* Wheelers-Street, *the* 16 *of* Octob. 1674. *I took it as well as possibly I could in such a noise & Disturbance; you know*

me

me to be an Indifferent person, as to the Parties concerned that day; being neither Baptist nor Quaker, nor ever was; and I do assure you I have done it with equal fairness on both sides, not being partial to one, more than another; and I have not, to my Knowledg, left out a material Sentence that past between them; And this you may publish with the Narrative.

Your Loving Friend,
Tho. Jennings.

The next day after the aforesaid Meeting, we received this following Letter from them.

NOt to insist at present upon your unfair Carriage yesterday towards us, and obstinately diverting us from the pursuit of our Charge against *T. H.* represented, and personated by *Jer. Ives*, the ground of our Call upon the Baptists for Justice, and of all our Meetings; to the manifest dislike of the indifferent Auditory, some of which, as your selves know gave publick Testimony of it. These are to let you know, that we do expect your consent to another Meeting the next week; in Order to prove our Charge against *Tho. Hicks*, which hath by you so often been evaded, and we interrupted in the management of it; For resolved we are, (in God's Strength) to go on to the detection of *Tho. Hicks* and his Abettors of their apparent injustice towards us; In order to which, we have desired five of our Friends to meet with a like number of yours, to confer of, and conclude upon such things as are necessary in order thereunto.

London, 17th of the 8th Month 1674.

W. Penn. G. Whitehead. G. Keith. Jasper Batt.

In Answer whereunto, we sent to them as follows.

YOurs 17th Instant, we received, wherein (to pass by your impertinent Reflections, it being your common failing to complain of others, when your selves are most guilty) you are pleased to signify your Resolutions to go on to the Detection (as you presume) of Tho. Hicks *and his Abettors, our Answer is, That we purpose (if the Lord please) to attend you in convenient time, accordingly we shall desire five persons to discourse with five of your friends thereabouts, expecting timely notice, when and where they may meet them.*

London, Oct. 19th. 1674.

Will. Kiffin,
Tho. Plant, &c.

Accor-

Accordingly, *Mr. Kiffin*, *Mr. Dyke*, *Mr. Paul*, *Mr. Snelling*, *Mr. King*, and *Mr. Plant*, did meet with *Will. Mead*, *John Osgood*, *Will. Welch* and several others, at *Tho. Rudyard's* House the 20th of *October*, where they debated the Proposals sent to the Quakers, and went over several of them; supposing *Will. Mead* and the rest with him, had consented; but upon the Discourse of the time, when the Meeting should begin. *Will. Mead* and his Friends, were for the next Friday, *Mr. Kiffin* and the rest, for the Friday seven-night; giving their Reasons why it could not be sooner; with which the others complyed, upon this condition, that *Geo. Keith's* business (because he lived far off, and Winter coming on) should be first examined, but because both they and we were in haste, the Conclusion was defer'd till the next day. And then *Mr. Kiffin* and the rest did meet them, and signified their compliance with the motion concerning *Geo. Keith*, as followeth. We do agree, that *Tho. Hicks* should in the first Meeting, speak to such matters as *Geo. Keith* is concerned in, provided, that afterwards the Paper of Charges be next spoken unto, in that order as they lie; for we desire one Article may be issued, before any other be insisted on; and that we may proceed in that method as is expressed in the aforesaid Proposals.

Upon this, the Quakers manifested some suspicion of the Proposals, as they were worded; hereupon *T. Rudyard* (as the most likely person to find a flaw if there were any) was imployed to examine and new-model them, which when he had done, one of their own Party said, 'twas but the same that we had proposed: Upon this, we verily thought that we should have agreed to sign the Propositions. Then *Will. Welch* produceth a paper, that crossed all they had Discoursed before; whereupon *Will. Kiffin* and those with him, seeing such disingenuous dealing, did conclude, 'twas to no purpose to Treat any longer with them; forasmuch as that they would not stick to any thing, though some of them pretended they had full power to agree; yet when that Paper was produced by *Will. Welch*, *Will. Mead* said he knew not of it. And since *G. Whitehead* hath said that they had not full Power.

The Contents of the said Paper, is as followeth.

An Answer to your Printed Proposals.

Since you have not only diverted us from pursuing our Charge against *T. H.* in publick, but also have declined a publick Meeting for that purpose, though not satisfactory, for the occasion given us, by your popular and publick beginning at *Barbican* in

our

absence, wherein your work appeared as designedly laid, and managed for *T. H.* and against the Quakers: and since such your declension, you have sent, and I owned new Propositions, for a more private Meeting; wherein you say, you are desirous that those particulars charged by us, in our late Papers against *T. H.* be fully spoken to; which we having taken into consideration, conceived to return you this Answer, to your Proposals, not intending that those we first agreed and met upon at *Barbican*, should be receded from.

1. To the First, we assent, for the first Meeting, that about 50. or more, not exceeding 100. on each side meet as hearers, and they to be nominated.

2. To the Second, we stand for our fifth Proposition made and accepted before our Meeting with you at *Barbican*, which unto we assent, that but three or four have the management of the Discourse, except such as be called in as Witnesses, or otherwise, *may have a necessary occasion of their Spirits to speak directly to the business in hand*; which liberty we grant you as well as our selves.

3. 4. 5. To your Third, Fourth, Fifth Proposals we assent.

6. That the first Meeting begin on the 23d Instant, at the 9th hour in the Morning, and to end with consent. However *T. H.* proferred a whole day in a week.

To the 7th Proposal, we say, That if we find by the first Meeting with you, That you design to do us Right, in as public a manner as *T. H.* hath done us wrong, by his gross and manifest Forgeries; and not to cover, or uphold him, in his iniquity therein, (when it is made appear) that then we consider of another Meeting once a week, if occasion be.

8. That each party have two to write; granted.

9. Your Ninth Proposal appears unreasonable, and renders your design suspitious, in providing, That (when our Paper is answered) *G. W.* and *W. P.* be obliged to give their Answers to such Charges as *T. H.* shall exhibit against them: For, first, our Charge be proved against *T. H.* he is not competent to prosecute us. Secondly, to oblige us to Answer his Charges without either mentioning the Nature of them; or specifying the particulars, that he grounds his Charges upon, is not fair, or as you would be dealt by; we having also dealt otherwise with you, as aforehand signified both the nature, and particulars of our Charge against *T. H.* as also at your desire given you particular notice thereof, by Notes in Writing.

10. That

10. That when the particulars of our Charge against *T. H.* are gone through, we have a Meeting with you to make out our exceptions against your late Book called *the Quakers Apology Answered*, as we have proposed in our Paper against *Tho. Hicks*. And thus far, we will further assent, that when we have done with *T. H.* about matters of Fact charged (together with our said exceptions) and that you have done us Justice therein, if you desire it, when your heat is over; we shall be willing if the Lord will, as convenient opportunity may be offer'd, to Discourse matters of Doctrine or Principles, with some others of you more competent, upon Questions first stated and agreed upon by both parties.

11. That if according to these Propositions, we be suffered chiefly to go through all the particulars of our Charge against *T. H.* and your said Book, the whole Discourse thereof be impartially drawn up, and published to the World.

12. That if you design to accuse us, or any of us, upon any of our Books; you give us first a Note of those Books, and the particular passages intended, as we have done to you; and that some days before the Meeting with you.

13. That you shall not be suffered to keep us from pursuing our Charge against *T. H.* for vile Forgery, *&c.* but that he be obliged to Answer directly; whether he confesseth or denieth the said Charge of Forgeries, *&c.* that we may proceed upon the particulars as proposed, and nothing else to intervene.

Lastly, If you consent to these Propositions, you and our Friends may agree upon the place to Meet at, however let us have your Answer under your hands.

London 17th 8th. Month 1674. *Will. Penn, George Keith, G. Whitehead, Jasper Batt.*

To the aforesaid Letter, this following Answer was sent.

YOurs Dated 19th Instant, came to one of our hands the 21th past nine at night; but why you should Antedate your Paper, we know not, (except you have a new Stile amongst your selves, which the World knows not of) for, when we met with your Friends the 20th Instant, we had not the least intimation thereof. The Contents of which, is very much like your selves: But 'tis to little purpose to complain, since the *Blackamore* cannot change his skin; only, we must acquaint you, that your saying (you condescend to return us this Answer) doth in no wise become

become you, forasmuch as we do not Treat with you as Superiours, but indeed as Persons departed *from the Christian Faith*. And therefore till you have exonerated your selves, Expressions less lofty and Imperious, would much better beseem you. You cry out for Justice, yet Act as if you were afraid of a fair Tryal, seeming to dread nothing more, than that *T. H.* should speak for himself; And to the end, that you might weaken his Testimony, you would (if possible) render him odious, which is a justifying what he hath Charged you with (*viz.*) *That 'tis not the Arguments, but the Man you would deal with.* Thus whilst you Clamour against him for Forgery, you do in your Practice manifestly acquit him; wherein you shew your selves not so wise as you would be accounted. And whereas you suggest, as if we declined a publick Meeting; This is as true as you are wont to speak. For, could such a Meeting be peaceably obtained, wherein there might be a free and full hearing of the matters in difference, we should gladly attend it, not doubting, but it would prove to your shame and Detection: for those open Confessions you make of your Faith, they signifie no more to us, than your palpable Equivocations, wherein you give the lye to your selves, which in due time may be effectually demonstrated to you.

That Addition of yours to our second Proposal (*viz.*) *That such as have a necessity upon their Spirits to speak*, &c. we cannot admit of, because we know 'tis ordinary with you when pinched, to pretend a motion to divert from the point in Question: And also the same necessity may be pleaded, to take all the time, as well as briefly to the matter in hand.

Your Answer to our 6th cannot be complyed with; neither with respect to the day, nor hour, or the conclusion; for we *will with consent*, intends neither more nor less to us, but when you give us leave, for should we depart before, you would be ready to call us (as your manner is) Fugitives, and Runawayes: and then to compleat your folly (though you be apparently baffled) you will delude the world with pretences to a Victory, for ere with such vain Boasts as these, that you Buoy up your selves and your poor deceived people.

To our Seventh, you are pleased to say, *That if you shall see Reason to do you Right, then you will consider of another Meeting*, &c. Which is as much as to say, That if *Tho. Hicks* should acquit himself, and we should publickly clear him, and condemn you, as false Accusers and Slanderers; then you will Meet no more with us, lest your Tenets should be too openly discovered and exposed.

Our

Our Ninth, *you do* (according to that Wisdom by which you are guided) *esteem unreasonable, and that it renders our design suspicious* (viz.) that *G. Whitehead* and *Will. Penn should be obliged to give their Answers to such Charges as Tho. Hicks shall exhibit against them.* And one Reason you give thereof, is, that *Tho Hicks be proved Guilty of that, whereof you accuse him, then he is no competent person to prosecute them*; certainly no sort of Men (your selves excepted) would be Guilty of such ridiculous and impertinent reasoning as this, for, were it supposed (though as yet, we see no reason to grant) that in some things, he might be mistaken, it will not therefore follow, that every thing he saith ought not to be credited; if it would, then for the like reason *G. Whitehead*, and *Will. Penn* cannot be competent persons to prosecute him, forasmuch as they do not only stand accused for, but in convenient time will be proved manifest Lyars: will you expect Justice from us, and at the same time deny it to us? Ought you not to do, as you would be done unto? Are you not ashamed of such instances of your folly? Certainly you are sensible, that something may be charged upon *G. W.* and *W. P.* which you are not willing the World should know of. Tis no wonder, that Guilty persons should make such a bustle to weaken *Tho. Hicks* his Evidence, but deceive not your selves, such silly shifts do but assuredly render you more suspicious.

To your Second Reason we Answer, let *G. Whitehead*, and *Will. Penn*, be obliged to give their Answer in the same Meeting propounded to be kept up. *Tho. Hicks* shall send them the particulars of their Charge.

You say farther, *Then when we have done you Justice, you will, as convenient opportunity may be, discourse matters of Doctrine, with some others of us, more competent*, &c. But why not with us? Why not with *Tho. Hicks*? Again what doth such promises grounded upon, *when a convenient opportunity may be*, signify more, then your common way of trifling, and speaking to no purpose? The Proposals we have made to you are fair, and as much as in Reason you can expect from us: But because, we were willing to comply as far as in reason we might with you, we yielded, those matters wherein *George Keith* was concerned should first be spoken unto; provided, that afterwards, the Paper of Charges be next spoken unto, in that Order as they lie, for we desire that one Article may be issued before any other be insisted on. And that you may not mistake us, or your selves, we shall not admit of any Discourse upon other particulars, (that is, after *G. Keiths* business is issued) till those Reasons which

T. H.

T. H. hath given, why he opposeth the Quaker to the Christian be fully cleared, for as you seem resolved to pursue (as you phrase it) your Charge against *T. H.* so we purpose (in the strength of God) to prove you, whether you are subverters of the Christian-Religion or not; And therefore we are determined to stand to our last Proposals, which if you accept of, Subscribe with your hands, and send them within a day or two, unto us.

London, October 22th 1674.

Tho. Paul,
Jos. Merton, &c.

Hereunto, they returned a large Paper, much of the same import with the former, concluding it thus: We see you except against six or seven material passages in our Proposals; and we see no reason why we should condescend to your Dilatory Work: But to consider some other way or expedient to clear our selves, especially since you have so much prejudged us.

G. Whitehead,

Geo. Keith.

Jasper Batt.

THE

THE POSTSCRIPT

READER,

THE want of a Traveller's indifferency in searching after the right way, hath occasioned many whose Judgments are weak, and Passions strong, to miscarry; because the Imaginations of such are easily possest with that they are most desirous of, and least capable to distinguish: from hence it is that the Quakers have boasted so much of the great Victories their Friends have obtained against the Baptists, believing all their leaders say to be true, because they strongly desire it should be so. But whoever shall compare the Account they have given of the two days Conferences, and this (in thy hand) together, will find, they have no more cause to Glory, than *Caligula's* Soldiers, who had nothing but *Cockleshels* to shew for the Trophies and spoiles of their great Victories, which will manifestly appear by the following Considerations.

1. It is observable that most of the time spent in the two days Conferences, was to prevail upon them to hear our Arguments to prove they were no Christians, and that their Ministers were Cheats and Impostors: This we conceived Reasonable; First, because it was contained in the first Article of their written Charge sent in against *T. H.* which was, for writing a Dialogue, and opposing a *Christian* to a *Quaker*. Secondly, Because many of the things *T. H.* had charged upon the

Quakers

Quakers were no otherwise true, but as they were the Consequences of their being no Christians, which if proved, the other things would follow; (viz.) that their suffering is vain and Ostentatious, and their talking of Christ and Scripture, but terms of Art to deceive by. Thirdly, we thought it highly reasonable to discover to the World, That the Quakers are no Christians, because they have rejected and disowned all to be so but themselves; as may largely be shewn out of several of their Writings: And one would have thought those that *Monopolize* this Title of Christianity, and a true Ministry to themselves, and deny it to all others, should have been more ready to stand in the defence thereof, than of their own personal Reputations; and have waved all other matters for the disquisition of that: But this they shewed an utter aversation to; pretending it was beside the business; when they were willing to pursue any other matter that was but transiently offered: Witness, their so earnest calling upon Mr. *Russel* for his Reasons why he supposed a by-stander to be a Papist (which was foreign to our business) when they could not be prevailed upon for three or four hours together, to hear our Reasons why they were no Christians; see the Quakers last account p. 39. and compare it with p. 72, 73. of this Book.

2. When we come to the Charge, which was for writing a Dialogue, *&c.* here they had taken offence because (as they said) a Dialogue was too Light and Romantick a way to express serious matters by: But when we shewed how their Friends had taken the same course to express things they called serious and Religious, then they told us *those were for Information and not for Disputation*; but when we shewed them that

Smith's

Smiths Chatechism, and *Solomon Eccles*, and other of their Writers had written controversial matters in the 'form of a Dialogue, then they told us that *their 'Friends did not call their Books Dialogues, but some-'what writ Dialogue-wise, or by way of Dialogue*; but then they told us at last 'Dialogues were harmless, 'if they did not misrepresent the person or his opini-'on whom they personated; provided they did not call 'it a Dialogue, but somewhat writ by way of Dia-logue, *&c.* 'See how these men quibble about words, when it is well known, that a Dialogue or *Dialogismus* is a figure of speaking, when as one is discoursing a thing by himself, as if he were talking with another and so makes Questions, and giveth Answers. See *Goldmans* Account of the word in his *Dictionary, &c.* but to take off this, we told them that *G. Fox* had writ a Discourse between a Papist and a Quaker, and did not say by way of Dialogue, or by way of Dis-course, but A Discourse; which was never any real Dis-course, but a feigned thing, and we offered to prove over and above, that he had abused and misrepresent-ed the person he presented in his Discourse; but *W. Penn* put off this and told us *he would discourse it another time*; though this was one great offence they took at *T. H*'s saying, *that he was a Forger, for framing a Book and calling it a Dialogue, as if it were real, when it was feigned and fictitious*, when many of themselves are Forgers and fictitious Writers at the same rate of reasoning.

3. It is observable that the Quakers throughout *both* their Accounts of the two Meetings, make use of the *vox populi* to credit their Crasie Cause: Sometimes telling their Reader the people shouted, and other-while hooted at the Baptists, *&c.* 'and at another time

they

they tell the World 'The *Baptists made such a noise* 'with *Laughing and Shouting, that they could not be heard, &c.* As if by this, they designed to make the World believe, they hear, as well as speak by Inspiration; otherwise, how could they so curiously distinguish between the Voice of the Baptists and others, in so great and promiscuous an Assembly, unless they would by this, Insinuate, that none of the Auditory were against their ridiculous Opinions, and Practices but the Baptists? This will further appear, by considering, that when one Mr. *Nesbat* in St. *Martins*, said of *W. Penn*, [*What a Coxcomb is that?*] they in their account *p.* 22. tell the World, it was a Baptist, that said so; which was both false and malicious; as appeareth by a Certificate before recited, under the persons hand that spake the Words.

4. It is Observable, that (by way of Reproach, and disgrace) they bring me in, as one called an *Arminian*-Anabaptist, which by interpretation, is one that holds Universal-Grace. See their account of the first Meeting at *Barbican*, *p.* 14.

And yet in the second Meeting, they reckon it among the Anabaptists Errors, that they deny Universal Grace: see last account, *p.* 22.

So that they are resolved to find fault with any thing, right or wrong, that will but gratifie their Interest, and obscure their designs from the Vulgar observations.

5. It is farther Observable, that in their Account of the *Barbican*-Meeting, *p.* 4. they tell the World, *That in all that great Assembly, there was scarce breathing-room allotted for above twenty of them.* This is most notoriously false, for they had a Gallery of the same dimensions with ours; for their Speakers, and a

Liberty for their Friends as Hearers equal with our selves; And where-as *they say, they had scarce breathing room for twenty*, it is well known that there were many hundreds of them then present in the Meeting, capable to ballance (by their Voices) any thing that was offered by way of Appeal to the Auditory.

6. *They Solemnly declare* (in their first account, *p.* 28.) *That with reverence they believe and confess to Christ, both as he is the Man Jesus, and God over all blessed for ever*, &c. (and yet they tell us in the same page) *that they are jealous of expressing their Faith in un-Scriptural Terms. As God-man, a distinct Person without us (which limits and confines him to remoteness) human Nature of Christ in Heaven, &c.*

It is worth Observation, to see how sadly they are put to their shifts, to cast a mist before the eyes of the Vulgar; one while they tell the people, that the Scriptures are not the Rule and Guide of Faith to the Saints; see *Edw. Burrough's* Works, *p.* 515. and *Smith* in his *Catechism*, *p.* 10, 11. tells his Child, *That the Spirit is the Rule. And if we look upon the Scriptures for the Rule, we give that to them which belongs to Christ.* And in another Book of theirs, called *Truths Defence*, *p.* 2. in Answer to *Parson Camelford* of *Stavely Chappel*, the Author having sent some Queries to the Parson, who instead of Answering them burned them. Thereupon he tells the Parson in the said Book, and page, *That he might as well have Condemned the Scriptures to the fire to be burnt, as his Queries he sent him; or that he might as well have said, the sayings of Christ and his Apostles were Absurd as his Queries*, they (meaning his Queries) *being given forth by the same Spirit*, and yet these Men would make the World believe, they have so great a *veneration*

tion for the *Scriptures*, that they fear to expreſs their Faith in unScriptural Language, but why ſo? if the Scriptures are not *the Rule of Faith*, or *that it is as great a ſin to burn your Books as to burn the Scriptures?* But farther they tell us, *That with Reverence they Believe and Confeſs to Chriſt both as he is the Man Jeſus, and God over all bleſſed for ever, &c.* And yet in the words following tell us, *That they are jealous of expreſſing, they Believe him to be God-man a diſtinct Perſon without them, which limits and confines him to remoteneſs; or Believing the human Nature of Chriſt in Heaven, &c.* By all which, thoſe that have no mind to be wilfully deluded, may plainly perceive that they do not own or acknowledg the human Nature of Chriſt in Heaven; but that they may come off with Credit, they tell us it is becauſe they are not willing *to expreſs their Faith in un-Scriptural Terms.* But what *baſe bogling* is here, when at another time *they deny the Scriptures to be a Rule of Faith, and ſay, that one may as well Condemn them to the Fire, as their Books:* But the Fallacy ends not here; for though they Rant and Rail againſt thoſe that deny the Divinity of Chriſt, yet themſelves do not own it, any otherwiſe than *Socinus* or *Crellius* might have owned it, if they had had the Quakers Art of Equivocation; for when they talk of the pre-exiſtence of Chriſt before he took Fleſh, they intend not the Son of God as the ſecond Perſon in the Trinity; for Father, and Son, in their Creed are but names to ſignifie the *Holy One*, for *W. Penn*, in his Sandy Foundation, tells us, *that God is a Holy one, and not a Holy three*: So that when they ſay Chriſt is God, they mean not the Son of God as the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity; But that *God is God* which neither *Socinus* nor *Crellius* ever denyed. So

that Father and Son are in the Quakers Dialect but two Names or manifestations, as *George Whitehead* calls them in his defence of *W. Penn* against Dr. *Owen* and Mr. *Vincent*, &c. And this farther appears, because they deny the Generation of the Son of God to be Eternal (and yet pretend to own the Divinity of Christ) for *George Whitehead* tells Mr. *Vincent*, *that it is a distracted and confused work to Assert that the Generation of the Son of God must be Eternal.* And in his Book called *Light and Life* p. 47. he brings in the Baptists saying, *that as he* [the Son] *was God, he was Co-Creator with the Father*, &c. (now who but a *Socinian* would find fault with such a Proposition?) to which *G. Whitehead* Replies, *That it is nonsence and and un-Scriptural-Language to tell of God being Co-Creator with the Father, or that God had Glory with God, before the World was*; *Doth not this* (saith he) *Imply two Gods, and that God had a Father?* By all this it appears that he denies the Son of God as a second Person in the Trinity to have any hand in the Creation (except by Son be meant God the Father) or that the Son of God as the second Person in the Trinity, had any Glory with the Father, before the World was: Doth not all this evidently discover, that though the Quakers do rail against the *Socinians*, they are worse themselves; being deceitful and *Equivocating* in sacred things? for if the *Socinians* could say that Father and Son were not two Persons, but differing Names to express God the Father by; and that by the pre-existence of the Son of God, is understood no second Person, but a pre-existence of God the Father, as the Quakers affirm; I say, could the Socinians Cant and Equivocate at that Rate, they would make one Heart in this Article with them: I would

would therfore know whether the Quakers can be Christians, while they do not own these two Propositions.

First, *That there is one God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is not the Son, nor a Man.*

Secondly, *That there is also one Lord Jesus Christ, who is not the Father, but the Son and a Man.*

Their not owning these great Articles, and their bogling and Equivocating about them, plainly declares they are no Christians; for they neither own the Divine nor the Human Nature of Christ: For if you ask them whether the Human Nature of Christ be in Heaven and a distinct Person without us; they say they are *jealous to express their Faith in such Terms*, &c. but they can express it to the contrary, and say he *is not a distinct Person without them*, though they are not Scripture-Terms, but Terms contrary to Scripture. Again, if you ask them what they mean by the *Divinity of Christ* (they talk so much of) they tell you they do not mean the second Person in the *Trinity*, or that the Son as such, was Co-Creator with the Father, and as such, had Glory with him before the World was; but that Father and Son are but two names or *manifestations* of one God: Thus they deny both the Divine and Human Nature of Christ (what-ever they may say to blind the World) and therefore they are no Christians.

7. Whoever shall compare this Account, and theirs together, will find how grosly they have Transplaced whole Paragraphs and Transferred a great part of what was spoke upon one occasion to another, to make what was spoke either impertinent or insignificant; and this is most apparent in their Account of the second Meeting, where they sometimes bring me in, saying what I never said; and otherwhile depraving the sence of what I did say: Thus e-

every passage that threatens danger to their Cause must mutilated and dismembred, and (as *Sampson* was by the *Philistins*) lose its hair and eyes, and then be made sport for their whole Party.

8. It is farther Observable, That they bring in many things as spoken in our presence, which (if ever they were spoke) were not spoke till after our departure; as what they mention in *p.* 64, 65, 66, 67, where they tell their Reader in a long harangue of words, some thing in their own Vindication as if spoken in my hearing (for they give no notice of my going away, till the middle of the 67. *p.*) when I was gone out of the Room some time before most of those Passages in the last recited Pages were spoken by them; and these they glory in abroad, as if we were baffled and silenced, & could not make any rejoinder to them, when their Consciences know, we were absent when most of those things were spoken; which gave many occasion to say, *That the Quakers could talk fast enough, when none was there to oppose them, though they stood like Mutes a little before, as having nothing to Answer.*

9. They cry out for all this, as the only Men abused, as if the injuries done to them at this turn by the Baptists, were as great as ever were done to Christ, or his Apostles or the Holy Martyrs; for they say, *p.* 3. of their last Account, *That the Reason of this their undertaking, was to vindicate their Faith, and Persons, from as black abuses, as have* ever *been practiced by Infidels, Jews, or called Christians.* Now if they had suffered as much from the Baptists, as themselves say they have (which I think few believe) Is it not most notoriously false, to say these are as black abuses as have been *Ever* practiced by Infidels, Jews or called Christians?

Christians? Surely, they that will believe this, will believe any thing, that Men that have Confidence enough, and Conscience little enough, shall impose upon them: For were not the abuses that Christ and the Apostles suffered from Infidels, and Jews, infinitely beyond all that ever the Quakers have suffered and were not the sufferings of the Martyrs in Queen *Maries* days (by Men called Christians) greater, and blacker (think you) than any the Quakers have suffered from the Baptists? And yet these Men who have suffered nothing from us, but a Discovery of their Impostures to the World; have the confidence to say, It is as black an abuse as hath *ever* been practiced, *&c.*

10. It is Observable, that in many places in their last Book (especially) in *p.* 60. they tell the World, That instead of my proving them no Christians, I put them to prove they were Christians, which is notoriously false, as the succession of my Arguments will abundantly manifest if considered, where they result and Issue; which indeed brought them to this pinch (*viz.*) They having said they had a Rule for their Faith and Practice, by Immediate Inspiration; I indeed put them to give an Instance in something or other, by which those Inspirations should be Evidenced to be from Heaven rather than *Mahomets or Muggleton's*, but to this we could never obtain any Answer, but what was impertinent (*viz.*) that they had the Witness of God in themselves, *&c.* And when we could not prevail upon them to Instance in something or other, that might take off the force of what I objected against them, I departed and left the Meeting; which when they perceived, *W. Penn* cries out, *They Run, they Run.* From this my departing they took occasion to *Triumph*, which no wise Man could see they had any Cause for; considering I did Discourse five or six hours with three of them. And that if my strength had been never so great, it had been but a prodigal expence of it, to lay it out in beating the Airy figments of their Fancies, who talked much to little purpose; and would Answer nothing to the Argument in hand, though pressed to it once and again. And therefore to take off the Edge of their boasting, I published a Paper presently after the Disputes, in which I did offer (and do still offer) to prove, that the Quakers are no Christians, and that their Preachers are Cheats and Impostors.

And that the World may know we are not singular in this Opinion concerning them, I shall give an account of the Judgments of several sober Ministers, who in their Epistle to Mr. *Faldo's* Book (lately Reprinted and sold by *Jonathan Robinson*, at the *Golden Lyon* in *Paul's Church-Yard*) Intituled *Quakerism*

no

to Christianity, tell us That [illegible] spel, and Indeavour to seduce well-meaning [illegible] speak in unintelligible words; And from whom they [illegible] Poison of their Anti-fundamental Doctrines, and [illegible] contradict many of the Essentials of Christianity [illegible] quently are no CHRISTIANS.

More to this purpose may be seen in the said Epistle Subscribed by,

Thomas Manton,	Richard Baxter,	Thomas Gouge,
Thomas Jacomb,	William Cooper,	William Jenkyn,
John Yates,	George Griffith,	Thomas Watson,
John Sheffield,	Matthew Barker,	Benjamin Needler,
Anthony Palmer,	John Singleton,	William Carnake,
Thomas Cole,	Andrew Parsons,	Stephen Ford,
Thomas Doolittle,	Richard Mayo,	Samuel Smith.

11. Whereas, they in their second Account *p.* 9. bid their Reader *Note, That* T. Hicks *had lodged himself safely in an Alehouse, and came not to them, but stayed there till the* Conti[illegible] departing [from the Meeting] *called him away*, &c. This is Maliciously and falsely suggested, to Insinuate as if *T. H.* had stayed in an Alehouse all the time we were at the Meeting (for none that reads these words but would be apt to put this interpretation upon them) whereas it is easie to prove by two of their own Friends, that he was not six Minutes in the said Ale-House; and that he did not so much as drink while he was there.

Thus the World may see that slanders and false suggestions lies point blank level to the Quakers *Genius*.

These things being seriously and impartially considered, together with the Accounts of the whole management of the matter on both sides, may be sufficient to Ballance the Judgment of those that are disposed to know the Truth thereof; which that they may so do, shall be the Prayers and Desires of thy Friend,

J[illegible]NES.